

any can any

SUPPLEMENT

TO THE

AMERICAN

AND

COMMERCIAL DAILY ADVERTISER.

by Dallas, Alexander James
AN EXPOSITION

OF THE

CAUSES AND CHARACTER

OF THE

LATE WAR WITH G. BRITAIN.

Baltimore, April 1815.

AN EXPOSITION

OF THE

CAUSES AND CHARACTER

OF THE

LATE WAR WITH GREAT BRITAIN.

THE extravagant pretensions of the British commissioners at Ghent, their assertion of a right to interfere with the territorial dominion established at the peace of 1783—their attempt to assert that the Indians residing on our soil were entitled to form alliances, and to be treated as a civilized people, laws of civil society to which the Indian tribes are strangers—the attempt to cut off a section of our territory, under the pretext of a road between Canada and Nova Scotia, for which there would be no need in peace, and which would afford them an inroad upon us during war—their occupancy of a part of Massachusetts unmolested by the state authority—their known designs on Orleans: all these and other facts known to the government of the U. States, left little prospect of a peace in the early part of the present year; it is believed that the government was apprized in the close of the last year, that peace could have been accomplished in August 1814, were it not for the encouragement which the British government received from three of the Eastern states to persevere in the war. In these views, the executive had determined to make a full and final appeal to the American People, and by presenting at one view to the country the causes and the progress of the war, shew the necessity of such vigour and efficient preparations for the campaign of this year, as would assure its successful and triumphant termination by the certain expulsion of the enemy from all his possession on the continent. The measure proposed by the Secretary for raising 100,000 men, was part of this plan of vigorous measures; and a declaration or exposition was prepared to go to the public; this able paper was ready for publication when the advices of a peace being concluded were received—a copy of it has accidentally fallen into our hands, and we think we can do no better service than give it to the public, as the best means of repelling the ribaldry issued by those whose chagrin is excited to the greatest extravagance by the successful and glorious termination of the war.—*Aurora.*

the British commissioners interfere with the territory of 1783—their attempt to acquire our soil were entitled to the civilized people, and the Indian tribes are strangers in the territory, under the pretence of Nova Scotia, for which there could afford them an invasion of a part of Massachusetts to their known designs on Ontario to the government of the United States in the early part of the present government was apprized that such a course could have been accomplished by the encouragement which was given to three of the Eastern States. In these views, the executive has made an appeal to the American people to the country the cases of the necessity of such a high campaign of this year, as a triumphant termination by the United States in all his possessions, and by the Secretary of War of this plan of vigorous negotiation was prepared to go to the press for publication when the reports were received—a copy of it was sent to us, and we think we can do it to the public, as the best means of showing whose chagrin is excited by a successful and glorious tri-

AN EXPOSITION, &c.

Whatever may be the termination of the negotiations at Ghent, the dispatches of the American commissioners, which have been communicated by the President of the United States to Congress, during the present session, will distinctly unfold to the impartial of all nations, the objects and dispositions of the parties to the present war.

The United States, relieved by the general pacification of the treaty of Paris, from the danger of actual suzerainty, under the evils which had compelled them to resort to arms, have allowed their readiness to resume the relations of peace and amity with Great Britain, upon the simple and single condition of preserving their territory and their sovereignty entire and unimpaired. Their desire of peace, indeed, "upon terms of reciprocity, consistent with the rights of both parties, as sovereign and independent nations,"* has not, at any time, been influenced by the provocations of an unprecedented course of hostilities; by the incitements of a successful campaign; or by the agitations which have seemed again to threaten the tranquility of Europe.

But the British government, after "a discussion with the government of America, for the conciliatory adjustment of the differences subsisting between the two states, with an earnest desire on their part (as it was alledged) to bring them to a favorable issue, upon principles of a perfect reciprocity, not inconsistent with the established maxims of public law, and with the maritime rights of the British empire ;"† and after "expressly disclaiming any intention to acquire an increase of territory,"‡ have peremptorily demanded, as the price of peace, concessions demanded merely for their own aggrandisement, and for the satisfaction of their adversary. At one time, they proposed, as *la condition sine qua non*, a stipulation that the Indians inhabiting the country of the United States, within the limits established by the treaty of 1783, should be included as the allies of Great Britain (a party to that treaty) in the projected pacification ; and that the definite boundaries should be settled for the Indian territory, upon a basis which would have operated to surrender to a number of Indians, not probably, exceeding a few thousands, the rights of sovereignty, as well as of soil, over nearly one third of the territorial dominions of the United States, inhabit-

* See Mr. Monroe's letter to Lord Castlereagh, dated January, 1814.

1913 See Lord Castlereagh's letter to Mr. Monroe, dated the 4th of November.

† See the American dispatch, dated the 12th of August, 1814.

ed by more than one hundred thousand of its citizens. And more recently, (withdrawing, in effect, that proposition) they have offered to treat on the basis of the *uti possidetis*; when, by the operations of the war, they had obtained the military possession of an important part of the state of Massachusetts, which, it was known, could never be the subject of a cession, consistently with the honor and faith of the American government.* Thus, it is obvious, that Great Britain, neither regarding "the principles of a perfect reciprocity," nor the rule of her own practice and professions, has indulged pretension, which could only be heard in order to be rejected. The alternative, either vindictively to protract the war, or honorably to end it, has been fairly given to her option; but she wants the magnanimity to decide, while her apprehensions are awakened, for the result of the Congress at Vienna, and her hopes are flattered, by the schemes of conquest in America.

There are periods in the transactions of every country as well as in the life of every individual, when self examination becomes a duty of the highest moral obligation; when the government of a free people, driven from the path of peace, and baffled in every effort to regain it, may resort for consolation to the conscious rectitude of its measures; and when an appeal to mankind founded upon truth and justice, cannot fail to engage those sympathies, by which even nations are led to participate in the fame and fortunes of each other. The United States, under these impressions, are neither insensible to the advantages, nor to the duties of their peculiar situation.— They have but recently, as it were, established their independence; and the volume of their national history lies open at a glance, to every eye. The policy of their government, therefore, whatever it has been, in their foreign as well as in their domestic relations, it is impossible to conceal; and it must be difficult to mistake. If the assertion, that it has been a policy to preserve peace and amity with all the nations of the world be doubted, the proofs are at hand. If the assertion, that it has been a policy to maintain the rights of the United States, but at the same time to respect the rights of every other nation, be doubted, the proofs will be exhibited. If the assertion, that it has been a policy to act impartially towards the belligerent powers of Europe, be doubted, the proofs will be found in record, even in the archives of England and of France. And if, in

* See the American dispatches, dated the 12th and 19th of August, 1814; the note of the British commissioners, dated the 19th of August, 1814; the note of the American commissioners, dated the 21st of August, 1814; the note of the British commissioners, dated the 4th of September, 1814; the note of the American commissioners of the 9th of Sept. 1814; the note of the British commissioners, dated the 19th Sept. 1814; the note of the American commissioners, dated the 26th of Sept. 1814; the note of the British commissioners dated the 8th of Oct. 1814; and the note of the American commissioners, of the 13th of Oct. 1814.

* See the note of the British commissioners dated the 21st of Oct. 1814; the note of the American commissioners, dated the 24th of Oct. 1814; and the note of the British commissioners, dated the 31st of Oct. 1814.

d of its citizens. And
 et, that proposition) they
 the *uti possidetis*; when,
 had obtained the military
 the state of Massachusetts,
 e the subject of a cession,
 o of the American govern-
 Great Britain, neither r-
 reciprocity," nor the rule
 has indulged pretension,
 to be rejected. The alter-
 at the war, or honorably o-
 option; but she wants the
 apprehensions are awakened,
 Vienna, and her hopes are
 st in America.

tions of every country as
 ual, when self examination
 al obligation; when the go-
 from the path of peace, and
 it, may resort for consola-
 ts measures; and when an
 ruth and justice, cannot fail
 hich even nations are led to
 s of each other. The Unit-
 ms, are neither insensible to
 f their peculiar situation.—
 established their independ-
 tional history lies open at a
 their government, therefore,
 signs well as in their comes-
 ceal; and it must be difficult
 t it has been a policy to pre-
 the nations of the world be

If the assertion, that it has
 ights of the United States, but
 ights of every other nation, be
 ited. If the assertion that it
 ally towards the belligerent
 e proofs will be found in re-
 and and of France. And if, in

the 12th and 19th of August, 1814;
 dated the 19th of August, 1814;
 dated the 21st of August, 1814; the
 dated the 4th of September, 1814; the
 dated the 9th of Sept. 1814; the note of
 h Sept. 1814; the note of the Amer-
 Sept. 1814; the note of the British
 1814; and the note of the American
 14.

missioners dated the 21st of Oct. 1814.
 s, dated the 24th of Oct. 1814; and
 dated the 31st of Oct. 1814.

line, the assertion that it has been a policy, by all honorable
 means, to cultivate with Great Britain those sentiments of mu-
 tual good will, which naturally belong to nations connected
 by the ties of a common ancestry, an identity of language, and
 a similarity of manners, be doubted, the proofs will be found in
 that patient forbearance, under the pressure of accumulating
 wrongs, which marks the period of almost thirty years, that e-
 lapsed between the peace of 1783, and the rupture of 1812.

The United States had just recovered, under the auspices of
 their present constitution, from the debility which their revolu-
 tionary struggle had produced, when the convulsive move-
 ments of France excited throughout the civilized world the
 mingled sensations of hope and fear—of admiration and alarm.
 The interest which those movements would, in themselves, have
 excited, was incalculably increased, however, as soon as Great
 Britain became a party to the first memorable coalition against
 France, and assumed the character of a belligerent power; for,
 it was obvious, that the distance of the scene would no longer
 exempt the United States from the influence and the evils of
 the European conflict. On the one hand, their government
 was connected with France by treaties of alliance and com-
 merce; and the services which that nation had rendered to the
 cause of American independence, had made such impressions
 upon the public mind, as no virtuous statesman could rigidly
 condemn, and the most rigorous statesman would have sought
 in vain to efface. On the other hand, Great Britain, leaving
 the treaty of 1783 unexecuted, forcibly retained the American
 posts upon the northern frontier; and, slighting every overture
 to place the diplomatic and commercial relations of the two
 countries upon a fair and friendly foundation,† seemed to con-
 template the success of the American revolution, in a spirit of
 unextinguishable animosity. Her voice had, indeed, been heard
 from Quebec and Montreal, instigating the savages to war;—
 Her invisible arm was felt in the defeats of general Harmer||
 and general St. Clair,§ and even the victory of general Wayne¶
 was achieved in the presence of a fort which she had erected,
 far within the territorial boundaries of the United States, to sti-
 mulate and countenance the barbarities of the Indian warrior.**
 Yet the American government, neither yielding to popular
 feeling, nor acting upon the impulse of national resentment,
 hastened to adopt the policy of a strict and steady neutrality—
 and solemnly announced that policy to the citizens at home, and
 to the nations abroad, by the proclamation of the 22d of April,
 1793. Whatever may have been the trials of its pride, and of

† See Mr. Adams's correspondence.

‡ See the speeches of lord Dorchester.

§ On the waters of the Miami of the lake, on the 21st of October, 1790.

¶ At Fort recovery, on the 4th of November, 1791.

¶ On the Miami of lakes, in August 1794.

** See the correspondence between Mr. Randolph, the American secretary,
 of state, and Mr. Hammond, the British plenipotentiary, dated May and
 June, 1794.

6

its fortitude; whatever may have been the imputations upon its fidelity and its honor, it will be demonstrated in the sequel, that the American government, throughout the European contest, and amidst all the changes of the objects and the parties that have been involved in that contest, have inflexibly adhered to the principles which were thus, authoritatively, established to regulate the conduct of the United States.

It was reasonable to expect that a proclamation of neutrality, issued under the circumstances which have been described, would command the confidence and respect of Great Britain, however offensive it might prove to France, as contravening essentially the exposition which she was anxious to bestow on the treaties of commerce and alliance. But experience has shown, that the confidence and respect of Great Britain are not to be acquired by such acts of impartiality and independence. Under every administration of the American government, the experiment has been made, and the experiment has been equally unsuccessful; for it was not more effectually ascertained in the year 1612, than at antecedent periods, that an exemption from the maritime usurpation, and the commercial monopoly of G. Britain could only be obtained upon the condition of becoming an associate in her enmities and her wars. While the proclamation of neutrality was still in the view of the British minister, an order of the 8th of June, 1793, issued from the cabinet, by virtue of which, "all vessels loaded wholly or in part with corn, flour, or meal, bound to any port in France, or any port occupied by the armies of France," were required to be carried forcibly into England, and the cargoes were either to be sold there, or security was to be given that they should only be sold in the ports of a country in amity with his Britannic majesty.* The moral character of an avowed design to inflict famine upon the whole of the French people, was at that time, properly estimated throughout the civilized world; and so glaring an infraction of neutral rights, as the British order was calculated to produce, did not escape the severities of diplomatic animadversion and remonstrance. But this aggression was soon followed by another of a more hostile cast. In the war of 1756, Great Britain had endeavored to establish the rule, that neutral nations were not entitled to enjoy the benefits of a trade with the colonies of a belligerent power, from which, in the season of peace, they were excluded by the parent state. The rule stands without any positive support from any general authority on public law. If it be true, that some treaties contain stipulations, by which the parties expressly exclude each other from the commerce of their respective colonies; and if it be true, that the ordinances of a particular state often provide for the exclusive enjoyment of its colonial commerce; still Great Britain cannot be authorised to deduce the rule of the war of 1756, by implication, from such treaties and such ordinances, while it is

* See the order in council of the 8th of June, 1793, and the remonstrance of the American government.

the imputations upon its
 rated in the sequel, that
 the European contest,
 ets and the parties that
 ve inflexibly adhered to
 itatively, established to
 es.
 elamation of neutrality,
 have been described,
 spect of Great Britain,
 nce, as contravening es-
 anxious to bestow on the
 t experience has shown,
 at Britain are not to be
 and independence. Un-
 can government, the ex-
 eriment has been equally
 ctually ascertained in the
 that an exemption from
 mercial monopoly of G.
 he condition of becoming
 wars. While the procla-
 ew of the British minister,
 ued from the cabinet, by
 wholly or in part with
 rt in France, or any port
 ere required to be carried
 es were either to be sold
 t they should only be sold
 h his Britannic majesty.*
 sign to inflict famine upon
 at that time, properly es-
 ld; and so glaring an in-
 itish order was calculated
 ies of diplomatic animad-
 aggression was soon fol-
 cast. In the war of 1756,
 blish the rule, that neutral
 ne benefits of a trade with
 from which, in the season
 ne parent state. The rule
 from any general authority
 me treaties contain stipula-
 y exclude each other from
 onies; and if it be true, that
 often provide for the exclu-
 merce; still Great Britain
 rule of the war of 1756, by
 such ordinances, while it is
 June, 1793, and the remonstrance

not true, that the rule forms a part of the law of nations; nor
 that it has been adopted by any other government; nor that ev-
 en Great Britain herself has uniformly practised upon the
 rule; since its application was unknown from the war of 1756,
 until the French war of 1792, including the entire period of
 the American war. Let it be, argumentatively, allowed, how-
 ever, that Great Britain possessed the right, as well as the pow-
 er, to revive and enforce the rule; yet, the time and the man-
 ner of exercising the power, would afford ample causes for re-
 proach. The citizens of the United States had openly engag-
 ed in an extensive trade with the French islands in the West
 Indies, ignorant of the alleged existence of the rule of the war
 of 1756, or unapprised of any intention to call it into action,
 when the order of the 6th of November, 1793 was silently cir-
 culated among the British cruisers, consigning to legal adjudi-
 cation "all vessels laden with goods, the produce of any colo-
 ny of France, or carrying provisions or supplies for the use of
 any such colony."† A great portion of the commerce of the
 United States was thus annihilated at a blow; the amicable
 dispositions of the government were again disregarded and con-
 temned; the sensibility of the nation was excited to a high de-
 gree of resentment, by the apparent treachery of the British or-
 der; and a recourse to reprisals, or to war, for indemnity and
 redress, seemed to be unavoidable. But the love of justice had es-
 tablished the law of neutrality; and the love of peace taught a
 lesson of forbearance. The American government, therefore,
 rising superior to the provocations and the passions of the day,
 instituted a special mission to represent, at the court of London,
 the injuries and the indignities which it had suffered; "to vin-
 dicate its rights with firmness, and to cultivate peace with sin-
 cerity."‡ The immediate result of this mission, was a treaty of
 amity, commerce, and navigation, between the United States
 and Great Britain which was signed by the negociators on the
 19th of November, 1794, and finally ratified, with the consent
 of the Senate, in the year 1795. But both the mission and its
 result, serve also to display the independence and the impartiali-
 ty of the American government, in asserting its rights and
 performing its duties, equally unawed and unbiassed by the in-
 struments of belligerent power or persuasion.

On the foundation of this treaty the United States, in a pure
 spirit of good faith and confidence, raised the hope and the ex-
 pectation, that the maritime usurpations of Great Britain would
 cease to annoy them; that all doubtful claims of jurisdiction
 would be suspended; and that even the exercise of an incon-
 testible right would be so modified, as to present neither insult
 nor outrage, nor inconvenience, to their flag or to their commerce;
 but the hope and the expectation of the United States have
 been fatally disappointed. Some relaxation in the rigor, with-

† See the British order of the 6th of November, 1793.

‡ See the president's message to the senate, of the 16th of April 1794
 nominating Mr. Jay as envoy extraordinary to his Britannic majesty.

out any alteration in the principle, of the order in council of the 6th November, 1793, was introduced by the subsequent orders of the 8th of January, 1794, and the 25th of January, 1798: but from the ratification of the treaty of 1794, until the short respite afforded by the treaty of Amiens, in 1802, the commerce of the United States continued to be the prey of British cruisers and privateers, under the adjudicating patronage of the British tribunals. Another grievance, however, assumed at this epoch a form and magnitude which casts shade over the social happiness, as well as the political independence of the nation — The merchant vessels of the United States were arrested on the high seas, while in the prosecution of distant voyages; considerable numbers of their crews were impressed into the naval service of Great Britain; the commercial adventures of the owners were often, consequently, defeated; and the loss of property, the embarrassments of trade and navigation, and the scene of domestic affliction, became intolerable. This grievance (which constitutes an important surviving cause of the American declaration of war) was early, and has been incessantly, urged upon the attention of the British government. Even in the year 1792, they were told of "the irritation that it had excited — and of the difficulty of avoiding to make immediate reprisals on their seamen in the United States."[¶] They were told "that so many instances of the kind had happened, that it was quite necessary that they should explain themselves on the subject, and be allowed to disavow and punish such violence, which had never been experienced from any other nation."[§] And they were told "of the inconvenience of such conduct, and of the impossibility of letting it go on, so that the British ministry should be made sensible of the necessity of punishing the past, and preventing the future."[¶] But after the treaty of amity, commerce, and navigation, had been ratified, the nature and the extent of the grievance became still more manifest; and it was clearly and firmly presented to the view of the British government, as leading unavoidably to discord and war between the two nations. They were told, "that unless they would come to some accommodation which might ensure the American seamen against this oppression, measures would be taken to cause the inconvenience to be equally felt on both sides". They were told "that the impressment of American citizens, to serve on board of British armed vessels, was not only an injury to the unfortunate individuals, but it naturally excited certain emotions in the breasts of the nation to whom they belong, and of the just and humane of every country; and that an expectation was indulged that orders would be given, that the Americans so circumstanced should be immediately liberated, and that the British

[¶] See the letter of Mr. Jefferson, secretary of state, to Mr. Pinkney, minister at London, dated 11th of June, 1792.

[§] See the letter from the same to the same, dated the 12th of Oct. 1792.

[¶] See the letter from the same to the same, dated the 6th Nov. 1792.

^{*} See the letter from Mr. Pinkney, minister at London, to the secretary of state, dated 13th March, 1793.

off
we
tha
in
tha
179
dro
ed
can
ly,
Br
Sta
frie
pre
offi
from
as
cha
in t
Am
ious
foot
rica
deap
right
that
ship
and
nial
unre
less
prac
whic
mor
prev
wron
men
whic
Su
gove
to th
stran
"S
30th
† S
dated
1 S
at Lon
§ S
1796
¶ S
the U
1800.

the order in council of
by the subsequent or-
25th of January, 1798:
of 1794, until the short
ns, in 1802, the com-
be the prey of British
ating patronage of the
ever, assumed at this
shade over the social
dence of the nation —
s were arrested on the
istant voyages; consi-
pressed into the naval
adventures of the own-
and the loss of proper-
rigation, and the scene
ble. This grievance
g cause of the Ameri-
s been incessantly, ur-
ernment. Even in the
tion that it had excited
te immediate reprisals.
They were told "that
ened, that it was quite
selves on the subject,
h violence, which had
tion."§ And they were
ot, and of the impossi-
ish ministry should be
ning the past, and pre-
y of amity, commerce,
ature and the extent of
t; and it was clearly
e British government,
ar between the two na-
y would come to some
e American seamen a-
be taken to cause the
sides*. They were told
zens, to serve on board
n injury to the unfortu-
ertain emotions in the
ng, and of the just and
expectation was indulg-
Americans so circum-
d, and that the British
state, to Mr. Pinkney, mi-
ated the 12th of Oct. 1792.
ated the 6th Nov. 1792.
London, to the secretary of

officers should in future abstain from similar violences.** They were told, "that the subject was of much greater importance than had been supposed; and that, instead of a few, and those in many instances equivocal cases, the American minister at the court of London had, in nine months, (part of the years 1796 and 1797) made applications for the discharge of two hundred and seventy one seamen, who had, in most cases, exhibited such evidence as to satisfy him, that they were real Americans, forced into the British service and persevering, generally, in refusing pay and bounty."‡ They were told, "that if the British government had any regard to the rights of the United States, any respect for the nation, and placed any value on their friendship, it would facilitate the means of relieving their oppressed citizens."§ They were told, "that the British naval officers often impressed Swedes, Danes, and other foreigners from the vessels of the United States; that they might, with as much reason, rob American vessels of the property or merchandise of Swedes, Danes, and Portuguese, as seize and detain in their service the subjects of those nations found on board of American vessels; and that the president was extremely anxious to have this business of impressing placed on a reasonable footing."¶ And they were told, "that the impressment of American seamen was an injury of very serious magnitude, which deeply affected the feelings and honor of the nation; that no right had been asserted, to impress the natives of America; yet that they were impressed; they were dragged on board British ships of war with the evidence of citizenship in their hands, and forced by violence there to serve, until conclusive testimonials of their birth could be obtained; that many must perish unrelieved, and all were detained a considerable time, in lawless and injurious confinement; that the continuance of the practice must inevitably produce discord between two nations which ought to be the friends of each other; and that it was more advisable to desist from, and to take effectual measures to prevent, an acknowledged wrong, than by perseverance in that wrong, to excite against themselves the well founded resentments of America, and force the government into measures which may very possibly terminate in an open rupture."‡

Such were the feelings and the sentiments of the American government under every change of its administration, in relation to the British practice of impressment; and such the remonstrances addressed to the justice of Great Britain. It is obvi-

* See the note of Mr. Jay, envoy extraordinary, to lord Grenville, dated the 30th July, 1794.

† See the letter of Mr. King, minister at London, to the secretary of state, dated the 13th of April, 1797.

‡ See the letter of Mr. Pickering, secretary of state, to Mr. King, minister at London, dated the 10th of September, 1796.

§ See the letter from the same to the same, dated the 26th of October, 1796.

¶ See the letter from Mr. Marshall, secretary of state, (now chief justice of the United States,) to Mr. King, minister at London, dated the 20th Sept. 1800.

ous, therefore, that this cause, independent of every other, has been uniformly deemed a just and certain cause of war; yet, the characteristic policy of the United States still prevailed: remonstrance was only succeeded by negotiation; and every assertion of American rights was accompanied with an overture, to secure, in any practicable form, the rights of Great Britain.** Time, seemed, however, to render it more and more difficult to ascertain and fix the standard of the British rights, according to the succession of the British claims. The right of entering and searching an American merchant ship, for the purpose of impressment, was, for a while, confined to the case of British deserters; and even so late as the month of February, 1800, the minister of his Britannic majesty, then at Philadelphia, urged the American government, "to take into consideration, as the only means of drying up every source of complaint, and irritation, upon that head, a proposal which he had made two years before, in the name of his majesty's government, for the reciprocal restitution of deserters."†† But this project of a treaty was then deemed inadmissible, by the president of the United States, and the chief officers of the executive departments of the government, whom he consulted for the same reason, specifically, which, at a subsequent period, induced the president of the U. States, to withhold his approbation from the treaty negotiated by the American ministers at London, in the year 1806; namely: "that it did not sufficiently provide against the impressment of American seamen;"‡ and "that it is better to have no article, and to meet the consequences, than not to enumerate merchant vessels on the high seas, among the things not to be forcibly entered in search of deserters."§ But the British claim, expanding with singular elasticity, was soon found to include a right to enter American vessels on the high seas, in order to search for and seize all British seamen; it next embraced the case of every British subject; and finally, in its practical enforcement, it has been extended to every mariner, who could not prove, upon the spot, that he was a citizen of the United States.

While the nature of the British claim was thus ambiguous and fluctuating, the principle to which it was referred, for justification and support, appeared to be, at once, arbitrary and illusory. It was not recorded in any positive code of the law of nations; it was not displayed in the elementary works of the civilian; nor had it ever been exemplified in the maritime usages

** See particularly, Mr. King's propositions to lord Grenville, and lord Hawkesbury, of the 13th April, 1797, the 15th of March, 1799, the 25th Feb. 1801, and in July 1813.

†† See Mr. Liston's note to Mr. Pickering, the secretary of state, dated the 4th of Feb. 1800.

‡ See the opinion of Mr. Pickering, secretary of state, enclosing the plan of a treaty, dated the 3d May, 1800, and the opinion of Mr. Wolcott, secretary of the treasury, dated the 14th of April, 1800.

§ See the opinion of Mr. Stoddart, secretary of the navy, dated the 23d of April, 1800, and the opinions of Mr. Lee, attorney general, dated the 26th of Feb. and the 30th of April, 1800.

lent of every other, has
tain cause of war; yet,
States still prevailed;
negociation; and every
mpianed with an over-
the rights of Great Bri-
nder it more and more
rd of the British rights,
sh claims. The right of
erchant ship, for the pur-
s, confined to the case of
the month of February,
majesty, then at Philadel-
," "to take into considera-
every source of complaint,
osal which he had made
majesty's government, for
But this project of a
by the president of the
of the executive depart-
nsulted for the same rea-
quent period, induced the
d his approbation from the
ministers at London, in the
sufficiently provide against
n;†† and "that it is better
consequences, than not to
high seas, among the things
of deserters."‡‡ But the
ngular elasticity, was soon
merican vessels on the high
e all British seamen; it next
subject; and finally, in its
extended to every mariner,
that he was a citizen of the

claim was thus ambiguous
which it was referred, for jus-
se, at once, arbitrary and il-
y positive code of the law of
elementary works of the ci-
plified in the maritime usages
sitions to lord Grenville, and lord
e 15th of March, 1799, the 25th
ing, the secretary of state, dated

secretary of state, enclosing the plan
the opinion of Mr. Wolcott, secre-
April, 1800.
secretary of the navy, dated the 23d
ec, attorney general, dated the 26th

of any other country, in any other age. In truth, it was the off-
spring of the municipal law of Great Britain alone; equally o-
perative in a time of peace, and in a time of war; and, under
all circumstances, inflicting a coercive jurisdiction, upon the
commerce and navigation of the world.

For the legitimate rights of the belligerent powers, the Uni-
ted States had felt and evinced a sincere and open respect. Al-
though they had marked a diversity of doctrine among the most
celebrated jurists, upon many of the litigated points of the law
of war; although they had formerly espoused, with the example
of the most powerful government of Europe, the principles of
the armed neutrality, which were established in the year 1780,
upon the basis of the memorable declaration of the empress of
all the Russias; and although the principles of that declaration
have been incorporated into all their public treaties, except in
the instance of the treaty of 1794; yet, the United States, still
faithful to the pacific and impartial policy which they professed,
did not hesitate, even at the commencement of the French revo-
lutionary war, to accept and allow the exposition of the law of
nations, as it was then maintained by Great Britain; and, con-
sequently, to admit, upon a much contested point, that the pro-
perty of her enemy, in their vessels, might be lawfully captur-
ed as prize of war.* It was, also, freely admitted, that a bel-
ligerent power had a right with proper cautions, to enter and
search American vessels, for the goods of an enemy, and for
articles contraband of war; that, if upon a search, such goods
or articles were found, or if, in the course of the search, per-
sons in the military service of the enemy were discovered, a bel-
ligerent had a right, in doubtful cases, to carry American ves-
sels to a convenient station, for further examination; and that a
belligerent had a right to exclude American vessels from ports
and places, under the blockade of an adequate naval force.—
These rights the law of nations might, reasonably, be deemed
to sanction; nor has a fair exercise of the powers necessary
for the enjoyment of these rights, been, at any time, controvert-
ed, or opposed, by the American government.

But, it must be again remarked, that the claim of Great Bri-
tain was not to be satisfied, by the most ample and explicit re-
cognition of the law of war; for, the law of war treats only of
the relations of a belligerent to his enemy, while the claim of
Great Britain embraced, also, the relations between a sovereign
and his subjects. It was said, that every British subject was
bound by a tie of allegiance to his sovereign, which no lapse
of time, no change of place, no exigency of life, could possibly
weaken, or dissolve. It was said, that the British sovereign
was entitled, at all periods, and on all occasions, to the serv-
ices of his subjects. And it was said, that the British vessels of

* See the correspondence of the year 1792 between Mr. Jefferson, secreta-
ry of state, and the ministers of Great Britain and France. See also Mr.
Jefferson's letter to the American minister at Paris, of the same year, re-
questing the recall of Mr. Genet.

war upon the high seas, might lawfully and forcibly enter the merchant vessels of every other nation (for the theory of these pretensions is not limited to the case of the United States, although that case has been, almost exclusively, affected by their practical operation) for the purpose of discovering and impressing British subjects.† The United States presume not to discuss the forms, or the principles, of the governments established in other countries. Enjoying the right and the blessing of self-government, they leave, implicitly, to every foreign nation, the choice of its social and political institutions. But, whatever may be the form, or the principle, of government, it is an universal axiom of public law, among sovereign and independent states, that every nation is bound so to use and enjoy its own rights, as not to injure, or destroy, the rights of any other nation. Say then, that the tie of allegiance cannot be severed, or relaxed, as respects the sovereign and the subject; and say, that the sovereign is, at all times, entitled to the services of the subject; still, there is nothing gained, in support of the British claim, unless it can, also, be said, that the British sovereign has a right to seek and seize his subject, while actually within the dominion, or under the special protection, of another sovereign state. This will not, surely, be denominated a process of the law of nations, for the purpose of enforcing the rights of war; and if it shall be tolerated as a process of the municipal law of Great Britain, for the purpose of enforcing the right of the sovereign to the service of his subjects, there is no principle of discrimination, which can prevent its being employed in peace, or in war, with all the attendant abuses of force and fraud, to justify the seizure of British subjects for crimes, or for debts; and the seizure of British property, for any cause that shall be arbitrarily assigned. The introduction of these degrading novelties into the maritime code of nations, it has been the arduous task of the American government, in the onset, to oppose; and it rests with all other governments to decide, how far their honour and their interests must be eventually implicated, by a tacit acquiescence, in the successive usurpations of the British flag. If the right claimed by Great Britain be, indeed, common to all governments, the ocean will exhibit, in addition to its many other perils, a scene of everlasting strife and contention: but what other government has ever claimed or exercised the right? If the right shall be exclusively established as a trophy of the naval superiority of Great Britain, the ocean, which has been sometimes emphatically denominated, "the highway of nations," will be identified, in occupancy and use, with the dominions of the British crown; and every other nation must enjoy the liberty of passage, upon the payment of a tribute or the indulgence of a licence: but what nation is prepared for this sacrifice of its honor and its interests? And if, after all, the right be now asserted (as experience too plainly indicates) for the purpose of imposing upon the United States, to accommodate

† See the British declaration of the 19th of January, 1813.

and forcibly enter the
for the theory of these
the United States, al-
sively, affected by their
discovering and impress-
ates presume not to dis-
governments established
and the blessing of self-
very foreign nation, the
ons. But, whatever may
ment, it is an universal
and independent states,
enjoy its own rights, as
any other nation. Say
e severed, or relaxed, as
and say, that the sover-
ices of the subject; still,
he British claim, unless
sovereign has a right to
ly within the dominion,
another sovereign state,
process of the law of na-
rights of war; and if it
municipal law of Great
he right of the sovereign
no principle of discrimi-
employed in peace, or in
force and fraud, to justify
es, or for debts; and the
se that shall be arbitra-
se degrading novelties in-
been the arduous task
met, to oppose; and it
cide, how far their honour
y implicated, by a tacit
ations of the British flag,
be, indeed, common to
t, in addition to its many
ife and contention: but
ed or exercised the right?
ished as a trophy of the
e ocean, which has been
d, "the highway of na-
y and use, with the do-
every other nation must en-
yment of a tribute or the
on is prepared for this sa-
And if, after all, the right
plainly indicates) for the
States, to accommodate

the British maritime policy, a new and odious limitation of the sovereignty and independence, which were acquired by the glorious revolution of 1776, it is not for the American government to calculate the duration of a war, that shall be waged, in resistance to the active attempts of Great Britain, to accomplish her project; for, where is the American citizen, who would tolerate a day's submission, to the vassalage of such a condition?

But the American government has seen, with some surprise, the gloss, which the Prince Regent of Great Britain, in his declaration of the 10th of January, 1813, has condescended to bestow upon the British claim of a right to impress men, on board of the merchant vessels of other nations; and the retort, which he has ventured to make, upon the conduct of the United States, relative to the controverted doctrines of expatriation. The American government, like every other civilized government, avows the principle, and indulges the practice, of naturalizing foreigners. In Great Britain, and throughout the continent of Europe, the laws and regulations upon the subject, are not materially dissimilar, when compared with the laws and regulations of the United States. The effect, however, of such naturalization, upon the connexion, which previously subsisted, between the naturalized person, and the government of the country of his birth, has been differently considered, at different times, and in different places. Still, there are many respects, in which a diversity of opinion does not exist, and cannot arise. It is agreed, on all hands, that an act of naturalization is not a violation of the law of nations; and that, in particular, it is not in itself, an offence against the government, whose subject is naturalized. It is agreed, that an act of naturalization creates, between the parties, the reciprocal obligations of allegiance and protection. It is agreed, that while a naturalized citizen continues within the territory and jurisdiction of his adoptive government, he cannot be pursued, or seized, or restrained, by his former sovereign. It is agreed, that a naturalized citizen, whatever may be thought of the claims of the sovereign of his native country, cannot lawfully be withdrawn from the obligations of his contract of naturalization, by the force, or the seduction of a third power. And it is agreed, that no sovereign can lawfully interfere, to take from the service, or the employment, of another sovereign, persons who are not the subjects of either of the sovereigns engaged in the transaction. Beyond the principles of these accorded propositions, what have the United States done to justify the imputation of "harboring British seamen, and of exercising an assumed right to transfer the allegiance of British subjects?"* The United States have, indeed, insisted upon the right of navigating the ocean in peace and safety, protecting all that is covered by their flag, as on a place of equal and common jurisdiction to all nations; save where the law of war interposes the exceptions of visitation.

* See the British declaration of the 10th of January, 1813.

search, and capture: but, in doing this, they have done no wrong. The United States, in perfect consistency, it is believed, with the practice of all belligerent nations, not even excepting Great Britain herself, have, indeed, announced a determination, since the declaration of hostilities, to afford protection, as well to the naturalized, as to the native citizen, who, giving the strongest proofs of fidelity, should be taken in arms by the enemy; and the British cabinet, well know that this determination could have no influence upon those councils of their sovereign, which preceded and produced the war. It was not, then, to "harbor British seamen," nor to "transfer the allegiance of British subjects;" nor to "cancel the jurisdiction of their legitimate sovereign;" nor to vindicate "the pretension that acts of naturalization, and certificates of citizenship, were as valid out of their own territory, as within it;"† that the United States have asserted the honor and the privilege of their flag, by the force of reason and of arms. But it was to resist a systematic scheme of maritime aggrandizement, which, prescribing to every other nation the limits of a territorial boundary, claimed for Great Britain the exclusive dominion of the seas; and which, spurning the settled principles of the law of war, condemned the ships and mariners of the United States, to suffer, upon the high seas, and virtually within the jurisdiction of their flag, the most rigorous dispensations of the British municipal code, inflicted by the coarse and licentious hand of a British press gang.

The injustice of the British claim, and the cruelty of the British practice, have tested, for a series of years, the pride and the patience of the American government: but, still, every experiment was anxiously made, to avoid the last resort of nations. The claim of Great Britain, in its theory, was limited to the right of seeking and impressing its own subjects, on board of the merchant vessels of the United States; although in fatal experience, it has been extended (as already appears) to the seizure of the subjects of every other power, sailing under a voluntary contract with the American merchant; to the seizure of the naturalized citizens of the United States, sailing, also, under voluntary contracts, which every foreigner, independent of any act of naturalization, is at liberty to form in every country; and even to the seizure of the native citizens of the United States, sailing on board the ships of their own nation, in the prosecution of a lawful commerce. The excuse for what has been unfeelingly termed, "partial mistakes, and occasional abuse,"‡ when the right of impressment was practised towards vessels of the United States, is, in the words of the Prince Regent's declaration, "a similarity of language and manners:" but was it not known, when this excuse was offered to the world, that the Russian, the Swede, the Dane, and the German; that the French-

† See these passages in the British declaration, of the 10th of January, 1813.

‡ See the British declaration of the 10th of January, 1813.

...they have done no consistency, it is belief-
ations, not even except-
announced a determina-
to afford protection, as
ive citizen, who, giving
be taken in arms by the
know that this determi-
ose councils of their so-
the war. It was not,
r to "transfer the alle-
ancel the jurisdiction of
indicate "the pretension
ates of citizenship, were
within it;"† that the U-
nd the privilege of their
s. But it was to resist a
andizement, which, pre-
its of a territorial boun-
exclusive dominion of the
principles of the law of
ers of the United States,
ally within the jurisdic-
dispensations of the Bri-
oarse and licentious hand

and the cruelty of the
es of years, the pride and
ment: but, still, every
oid the last resort of na-
its theory, was limited to
ts own subjects, on board
States, although in fatal
(ready appears) to the sei-
ower, sailing under a vo-
erchant; to the seizure of
States, sailing, also, under
igner, independent of any
orm in every country; and
ens of the United States,
nation, in the prosecution
for what has been unfeel-
occasional abuse,"‡ when
ed towards vessels of the
Prince Regent's declara-
manners:" but was it not
to the world, that the
German; that the French-

ration, of the 10th of January,
of January, 1813.

man, the Spaniard, and the Portuguese; nay, that the African
and the Asiatic; between whom and the people of Great Bri-
tain there exists no similarity of language, manners, or com-
plexion; had been, equally with the American citizen and the
British subject, the victims of the impress tyranny.¶ If, how-
ever, the excuse be sincere, if the real object of the impress-
ment be merely to secure to Great Britain, the naval services
of her own subjects, and not to man her fleets, in every practi-
cable mode of enlistment, by right or by wrong; and if a just
and generous government, professing mutual friendship and re-
spect, may be presumed to prefer the accomplishment, even of a
legitimate purpose, by means the least afflicting and injurious
to others, why have the overtures of the United States, offering
other means as effectual as impressment, for the purpose avow-
ed, to the consideration and acceptance of Great Britain, been
forever eluded or rejected? It has been offered, that the num-
ber of men to be protected by an American vessel, should be
limited by her tonnage; that British officers should be permit-
ted in British ports to enter the vessel, in order to ascertain the
number of men on board; and that, in case of an addition to
her crew, the British subjects enlisted should be liable to im-
pressment.§ It was offered in the solemn form of a law, that
the American seamen should be registered; that they should be
provided with certificates of citizenship¶ and that the roll of
the crew of every vessel should be formally authenticated.* It
was offered that no refuge or protection should be given to de-
serters; but, that, on the contrary, they should be surrendered.†
It was "again and again offered to concur in a convention,
which it was thought practicable to be formed and which should
settle the question of impressment, in a manner that would be
safe for England, and satisfactory to the United States.‡ It was
offered, that each party should prohibit its citizens or subjects,
from clandestinely concealing or carrying away, from the ter-
ritories or colonies of the other, any seamen belonging to the o-
ther party.|||| And, conclusively, it has been offered and declared
by law, that "after the termination of the present war, it should
not be lawful to employ on board of any of the public or private

¶ See the letter of Mr. Pickering, secretary of state, to Mr. King, minis-
ter at London, of the 26th of October, 1796, and the letter of Mr. Marshall,
secretary of state, to Mr. King, of the 20th of Sept. 1800.

§ See the letter of Mr. Jefferson, secretary of state to Mr. Pinkney, minis-
ter at London, dated the 11th of June, 1792, and the letter of Mr. Pick-
ering, secretary of state, to Mr. King, minister at London, dated the 8th of
June, 1796.

¶ See the act of congress, passed the 28th of May, 1796.

* See the letter of Mr. Pickering, secretary of state, to Mr. King, minis-
ter at London, dated the 8th of June, 1796.

† See the project of a treaty on the subject, between Mr. Pickering, se-
cretary of state, and Mr. Liston, the British minister at Philadelphia, in the
year 1800.

‡ See the letter of Mr. King, minister at London to the secretary of state,
dated the 15th of March, 1799.

|||| See the letter of Mr. King, to the secretary of state, dated in July, 1803.

vessels of the United States, any persons except citizens of the United States; and that no foreigner should be admitted to become a citizen hereafter, who had not for the continued term of five years, resided within the United States, without being, at any time, during the five years, out of the territory of the United States."[§]

It is manifest then, that such provision might be made by law; and that such provision has been repeatedly and urgently proposed; as would, in all future times, exclude from the maritime service of the United States, both in public and in private vessels, every person, who could, possibly, be claimed by Great Britain, as a native subject, whether he had, or had not, been naturalized in America. ¶ Enforced by the same sanctions and securities, which are employed to enforce the penal code of Great Britain, as well as the penal code of the United States, the provision would afford the strongest evidence, that no British subject could be found in service on board of an American vessel; and, consequently, whatever might be the British right of impressment, in the abstract, there would remain no justifiable motive, there could hardly be invented a plausible pretext, to exercise it, at the expense of the American right of lawful commerce. If, too, as it has sometimes been insinuated, there would, nevertheless, be room for frauds and evasions, it is sufficient to observe, that the American government would, always be ready to hear, and to redress, every just complaint: or, if redress were sought and refused, (as preliminary course, that ought never to have been omitted, but which Great Britain has never pursued,) it would still be in the power of the British government to resort to its own force, by acts equivalent to war, for the reparation of its wrongs.—But Great Britain has, unhappily, perceived in the acceptance of the overtures of the American government, consequences injurious to her maritime policy; and, therefore, withholds it at the expense of her justice. She perceives, perhaps, a loss of the American nursery for her seamen, while she is at peace; a loss of the service of American crews, while she is at war; and a loss of many of those opportunities, which have enabled her to enrich her navy, by the spoils of the American commerce, without exposing her own commerce to the risk of retaliation or reprisals.

Thus, were the United States, in a season of reputed peace, involved in the evils of a state of war; and thus, was the American flag annoyed by a nation still professing to cherish the sentiments of mutual friendship and respect, which had been recently vouched, by the faith of a solemn treaty. But the American government even yet abstained from vindicating its rights, and from avenging its wrongs, by an appeal to arms. It was not an insensibility to those wrongs, nor a dread of British power, nor a subserviency to British interests, that prevailed at

[§] See the act of congress, passed on the 3d of March, 1813.

¶ See the letter of instructions from Mr. Monroe, secretary of state, to the plenipotentiaries for treating of peace with G. Britain, under the mediation of the emperor Alexander, dated the 15th of April, 1813.

persons except citizens of the
er should be admitted to be-
not for the continued term
United States, without being
out of the territory of the

provision might be made by
een repeatedly and urgently
nes, exclude from the mari-
both in public and in private
possibly, be claimed by Great
r he had, or had not, been
d by the same sanctions and
enforce the penal code of
code of the United States
ngest evidence, that no Bri-
ce on board of an American
r might be the British right
ere would remain no justifi-
nvented a plausible pretext,
ne American right of lawful
imes been insinuated, there
ude and evasions, it is suffi-
government would, always
ery just complaint: or, if re-
a preliminary course, that
out which Great Britain has
ne power of the British go-
t, by acts equivalent to war,
ut Great Britain has, un-
of the overtures of the A-
injuriously to her maritime
at the expense of her jus-
of the American nursery
e; a loss of the service of
war; and a loss of many of
bled her to enrich her navy,
erce, without exposing her
tion or reprisals.

a season of reputed peace,
ar; and thus, was the Ame-
professing to cherish the
respect, which had been re-
lemn treaty. But the A-
ned from vindicating its
s, by an appeal to arms. It
ngs, nor a dread of British
interests, that prevailed at

d of March, 1813.
Monroe, secretary of state, to
ich G. Britain, under the me-
15th of April, 1813.

that period, in the councils of the United States: but under all
trials, the American government abstained from the appeal to
arms then, as it has repeatedly since done, in its collisions with
France, as well as with Great Britain, from the purest love of
peace, while peace could be rendered compatible with the hon-
or and independence of the nation.

During the period which has hitherto been more particular-
ly contemplated (from the declaration of hostilities between G.
Britain and France in the year 1792, until the short-lived paci-
fication of the treaty of Amiens in 1802) there were not want-
ing occasions, to test the consistency and the impartiality of
the American government, by a comparison of its conduct to-
wards G. Britain with its conduct towards other nations. The
manifestations of the extreme jealousy of the French govern-
ment, and of the intemperate zeal of its ministers near the U.
States, were co-eval with the proclamation of neutrality; but
after the ratification of the treaty of London, the scene of vio-
lence, spoliation, and contumely, opened by France, upon the
U. States, became such, as to admit, perhaps, of no parallel,
except in the cotemporaneous scenes which were exhibited by
the injustice of her great competitor. The American govern-
ment acted, in both cases, on the same pacific policy; in the
same spirit of patience and forbearance; but with the same
determination also, to assert the honor and independence of
the nation. When, therefore, every conciliatory effort had
failed, and when two successive missions of peace had been
contemptuously repulsed, the American government, in the
year 1798, annulled its treaties with France, and waged a ma-
ritime war against that nation, for the defence of its citizens,
and of its commerce, passing on the high seas.—But as soon as
the hope was conceived, of a satisfactory change in the disposi-
tions of the French government, the American government has-
tened to send another mission to France; and a convention,
signed in the year 1800, terminated the subsisting differences
between the two countries.

Nor were the United States, able, during the same period, to
avoid a collision with the government of Spain, upon many im-
portant and critical questions of boundary and commerce; of
Indian warfare, and maritime spoliation. Preserving, howev-
er, their system of moderation, in the assertion of their rights,
a course of amicable discussion and explanation, produced mu-
tual satisfaction; and a treaty of friendship, limits, and navi-
gation was formed in the year 1795, by which the citizens of
the United States acquired, a right, for the space of three years,
to deposit their merchandises and effects in the port of New-
Orleans; with a promise, either that the enjoyment of that right
should be indefinitely continued, or that another part of the
banks of the Mississippi should be assigned for an equivalent
establishment. But, when in the year 1802, the port of New-
Orleans was abruptly closed against the citizens of the United
States, without an assignment of any other equivalent place of

deposit, the harmony of the two countries was again most seriously endangered; until the Spanish government, yielding to the remonstrances of the United States, disavowed the act of the intendant of New Orleans, and ordered the right of deposit to be reinstated, on the terms of the treaty of 1795.

The effects produced, even by a temporary suspension of the right of deposit at New Orleans, upon the interests and feelings of the nation, naturally suggested to the American government, the expediency of guarding against their recurrence, by the acquisition of a permanent property in the province of Louisiana. The minister of the United States, at Madrid, was, accordingly, instructed to apply to the government of Spain upon the subject; and, on the 4th of May, 1803, he received an answer, stating that "by the retrocession made to France, of Louisiana, that power regained the province, with the limits it had saving the rights acquired by other powers; and that the United States could address themselves to the French government, to negotiate the acquisition of territories which might suit their interest." But before this reference, official information of the same fact had been received by Mr. Pinkney from the court of Spain, in the month of March preceding; and the American government, having instituted a special mission to negotiate the purchase of Louisiana from France, or from Spain, whichever should be its sovereign, the purchase was, accordingly, accomplished for a valuable consideration (that was punctually paid) by the treaty concluded at Paris on the 30th of April, 1803.

The American government has not seen, without some sensibility, that a transaction, accompanied by such circumstances of general publicity, and of scrupulous good faith, has been denounced by the prince regent, in his declaration of the 10th of January, 1813, as a proof of the "ungenerous conduct" of the U. States towards Spain.† In amplification of the royal charge, the British negociators at Ghent, have presumed to impute the acquisition of Louisiana, by the U. States, to a spirit of aggrandisement, not necessary to their own security; and to maintain "that the purchase was made against the known conditions, on which it had been ceded by Spain to France;"‡ that "in the face of the protestation of the minister of his catholic majesty at Washington, the president of the U. States ratified the treaty of purchase;"§ and that "there was good reason to believe, that many circumstances attending the transaction were industriously concealed."¶ The American government cannot condescend to retort aspersions so unjust, in language so opprobrious; and peremptorily rejects the preten-

* See the letter from Don Pedro Cevallos, the minister of Spain, to Mr. C. Pinkney, the minister of the United States, dated the 4th of May, 1803, from which the passage cited is literally translated.

† See the Prince Regent's declaration of the 10th of January, 1813.

‡ See the note of the British commissioners, dated 4th September 1814.

§ See the note of the British commissioners, dated the 19th Sept. 1814.

¶ See the note of the British commissioners, dated the 8th of Oct. 1814.

ies was again most se-
government, yielding to
disavowed the act of
red the right of deposite
ty of 1795.

orary suspension of the
the interests and fee-
to the American go-
against their recurrence,
erty in the province of
ed States. at Madrid,
to the government of
n of May, 1803, he re-
retrocession made to
ned the province, with
ired by other powers;
ress themselves to the
acquisition of territories
before this reference,
d been received by Mr.
e month of March pre-
ent, having instituted a
use of Louisiana from
uld be its sovereign, the
d for a valuable consi-
the treaty concluded at

een, without some sen-
d by such circumstances
good faith, has been de-
claration of the 10th
ngenerous conduct" of
plication of the royal
ent, have presumed to
the U. States, to a spi-
o their own security;
was made against the
en ceded by Spain to
estation of the minister
the president of the U.
and that "there was
umstances attending the
ed." The American go-
aspersions so unjust, in
orily rejects the preten-

e minister of Spain, to Mr. C.
dated the 4th of May, 1803,
dated.
e 10th of January, 1813.
, dated 4th September 1814.
, dated the 19th Sept. 1814.
, dated the 8th of Oct. 1814:

sion of G. Britain, to interfere in the business of the United States and Spain; but it owes, nevertheless, to the claims of truth, a distinct statement of the facts which have been thus misrepresented. When the special mission was appointed to negotiate the purchase of Louisiana from France, in the manner already mentioned, the American minister, at London, was instructed to explain the object of the mission; and having made the explanation, he was assured by the British government, "that the communication was received in good part; no doubt was suggested of the right of the United States to pursue, separately and alone, the objects they aimed at; but the British government appeared to be satisfied with the president's view on this important subject."* As soon, too, as the treaty of purchase was concluded, before hostilities were again actually commenced between G. Britain and France, and previously, indeed, to the departure of the French ambassador from London, the American minister openly notified to the British government, that a treaty had been signed, "by which the complete sovereignty of the town and territory of New Orleans, as well as of all Louisiana, as the same was heretofore possessed by Spain, had been acquired by the U. States of America; and that in drawing up the treaty, care had been taken so to frame the same, as not to infringe any right of G. Britain, in the navigation of the river Mississippi."† In the answer of the British government, it was explicitly declared by lord Hawkesbury, "that he had received his majesty's commands to express the pleasure with which his majesty had received the intelligence; and to add, that his majesty regarded the care, which had been taken so to frame the treaty as not to infringe any right of G. Britain in the navigation of the Mississippi, as the most satisfactory evidence of a disposition on the part of the government of the U. States, correspondent with that which his majesty entertained, to promote and improve that harmony, which so happily subsisted between the two countries, and which was so conducive to their mutual benefit."‡ The world will judge, whether, under such circumstances, the British government had any cause, on its own account, to arraign the conduct of the U. States, in making the purchase of Louisiana; and, certainly, no greater cause will be found for the arraignment, on account of Spain. The Spanish government was apprized of the intention of the U. States to negotiate for the purchase of that province; its ambassador witnessed the progress of the negotiation at Paris; and the conclusion of the treaty, on the 30th of April 1803, was promptly known and understood at Madrid. Yet, the

* See the letter from the secretary of state, to Mr. King, the American minister at London, dated the 29th of January, 1803; and Mr. King's letter to the secretary of state, dated the 28th of April, 1803.

† See the letter of Mr. King, to lord Hawkesbury, dated the 15th of May, 1803.

‡ See the letter of lord Hawkesbury, to Mr. King, dated the 19th of May, 1803.

Spanish government interposed no objection, no protestation against the transaction, in Europe; and it was not until the month of September, 1803, that the American government heard, with surprise, from the minister of Spain, at Washington, that his catholic majesty was dissatisfied with the cession of Louisiana to the U. States. Notwithstanding this diplomatic remonstrance, however, the Spanish government proceeded to deliver the possession of Louisiana to France, in execution of the treaty of St. Ildefonso; saw France, by an almost simultaneous act, transfer the possession to the U. States, in execution of the treaty of purchase; and, finally, instructed the marquis de Casa Yrujo, to present to the American government, the declaration of the 15th May, 1804, acting "by the special order of his sovereign," "that the explanations, which the government of France had given to his catholic majesty, concerning the sale of Louisiana to the United States, and the amicable dispositions, on the part of the king, his master, towards these states, had determined him to abandon the opposition, which, at a prior period, and with the most substantial motives, he had manifested against the transaction"¶

But after this amicable and decisive arrangement of all differences, in relation to the validity of the Louisiana purchase, a question of some embarrassment remained, in relation the boundaries of the ceded territory. This question however the American government always has been, and always will be, willing to discuss, in the most candid manner, and to settle upon the most liberal basis, with the government of Spain. It was not, therefore, a fair topic, with which to inflame the Prince Regent's declaration; or to embellish the diplomatic notes of the British negotiators at Ghent. § The period has arrived, when Spain, relieved from her European labors, may be expected to bestow her attention, more effectually upon the state of her colonies; and, acting with the wisdom, justice and magnanimity, of which she has given frequent examples, she will find no difficulty, in meeting the recent advances of the American government, for an honorable adjustment of every point in controversy between the two countries, without seeking the aid of British mediation, or adopting the animosity of British councils.

But still the United States feeling a constant interest in the opinion of enlightened and impartial nations, cannot hesitate to embrace the opportunity, for representing in the simplicity of truth, the events, by which they have been led to take possession of a part of the Floridas, notwithstanding the claim of Spain to the sovereignty of the same territory. In the acceptance and understanding of the United States, the cession of Louisiana, embraced the country south of the Mississippi terri-

¶ See the letter of the marquis de Casa Yrujo, to the American secretary of state, dated the 15th of May, 1804.

§ See the prince regent's declaration of the 10th of January, 1813. See the notes of the British commissioners, dated 19th September, 8th October, 1814.

jection, no protestation and it was not until the American government of Spain, at Washington, satisfied with the cession notwithstanding this diplomatic government proceeded to France, in execution of, by an almost simultaneous U. States, in execution instructed the marquis American government, the de- "by the special order of which the government majesty, concerning the sale the amicable dispositions, towards these states, had position, which, at a prior motives, he had manifest-

arrangement of all differ- Louisiana purchase, a ined, in relation the boun- question however the Ame- always will be, willing and to settle upon the of Spain. It was not, inflame the Prince Re- e diplomatic notes of the period has arrived, when bors, may be expected to upon the state of her co- justice and magnanimity, pies, she will find no dif- of the American gov- of every point in contro- without seeking the aid of animosity of British coun-

a constant interest in the nations, cannot hesitate to ating in the simplicity of been led to take posses- withstanding the claim of territory. In the accep- ed States, the cession of of the Mississippi terri-

jo, to the American secretary

10th of January, 1813. See the September, 8th October, 1814.

tory, and eastward of the river Mississippi, and extending to the river Perdido; but "their conciliatory views, and their confidence in the justice of their cause, and in the success of a candid discussion and amicable negotiation with a just and friendly power, induced them to acquiesce in the temporary continuance of that territory under the Spanish authority." ¶ —When, however, the adjustment of the boundaries of Louisiana, as well as a reasonable indemnification, on account of maritime spoiliations, and the suspension of the right of deposit at New Orleans, seemed to be indefinitely postponed, on the part of Spain, by events which the United States had not contributed to produce, and could not control; when a crisis had arrived subversive of the order of things under the Spanish authorities, contravening the views of both parties, and endangering the tranquility and security of the adjoining territories, by the intrusive establishment of a government, independent of Spain, as well as of the United States; and when at a later period, there was reason to believe, that Great Britain herself designed to occupy the Floridas, (and she has, indeed, actually occupied Pensacola, for hostile purposes,) the American government, without departing from its respect for the rights of Spain and even consulting the honor of that state, unequal as she then was, to the task of suppressing the intrusive establishment, was impelled by the paramount principle of self preservation, to rescue its own rights from the impending danger. Hence the United States in the year 1810, proceeding step by step, according to the growing exigencies of the time, took possession of the country, in which the standard of independence had been displayed, excepting such places as were held by a Spanish force. In the year 1811, they authorized their president, by law, provisionally to accept of the possession of East Florida from the local authorities, or to pre-occupy it against the attempt of a foreign power to seize it. In 1813, they obtained the possession of Mobile, the only place then held by a Spanish force in West Florida; with a view to their own immediate security, but without varying the questions depending between them and Spain, in relation to that province. And in the year 1814 the American commander, acting under the sanction of the law of nations, but unauthorised by the orders of his government, drove from Pensacola the British troops, who, in violation of the neutral territory of Spain, (a violation which Spain it is believed must herself resent, and would have resisted, if the opportunity had occurred,) seized and fortified that station, to aid in military operations against the United States. But all these measures of safety and necessity were frankly explained, as they occurred, to the government of Spain, and even to the government of Great Britain, antecedently to the declaration of war, with the sincerest assurances, that the possession of the territory thus ac-

¶ See the proclamation of the president of the United States, authorizing governor Claiborne to take possession of the territory, dated the 27th of October, 1810.

quired, "should not cease to be a subject of fair and friendly negotiation and adjustment."

The present review of the conduct of the United States towards the belligerent powers of Europe, will be regarded by every candid mind, as a necessary medium to vindicate their national character from the unmerited imputations of the prince regent's declaration of the 10th January, 1813, and not as a medium, voluntarily assumed, according to the insinuations of that declaration, for the revival of unworthy prejudices, or vindictive passions, in reference to transactions that are past. The treaty of Amiens, which seemed to terminate the war in Europe, seemed also to terminate the neutral sufferings of America; but the hope of repose was, in both respects, delusive and transient. The hostilities which were renewed between Great Britain and France, in the year 1793, were immediately followed by a renewal of the aggressions of the belligerent powers upon the commercial rights and political independence of the United States. There was scarcely, therefore, an interval separating the aggressions of the first war from the aggressions of the second war; and although, in nature, the aggressions continued to be the same, in extent, they became incalculably more destructive. It will be seen, however, that the American government inflexibly maintained its neutral and pacific policy, in every extremity of the latter trial, with the same good faith and forbearance that, in the former trial, had distinguished its conduct; until it was compelled to choose from the alternative of national degradation or national resistance. And if Great Britain alone then became the object of the American declaration of war, it will be seen, that Great Britain alone had obstinately closed the door of amicable negotiation.

The American minister at London, anticipating the rupture between Great Britain and France, had obtained assurances from the British government, "that, in the event of war, the instructions given to their naval officers should be drawn up with plainness and precision; and, in general, that the rights of belligerents should be exercised in moderation, and with due respect for those of neutrals."† And in relation to the important subject of impressment, he had actually prepared for signature, with the assent of lord Hawkesbury and lord St. Vincent, a convention, to continue during five years, declaring that "no seaman nor seafaring person, should, upon the high seas, and

* See the letter from the secretary of state to governor Claiborne, and the proclamation, dated the 27th of October, 1810.

See the proceedings of the convention of Florida, transmitted to the secretary of state, by the governor of the Mississippi territory, in his letter of the 17th of October, 1810; and the answer of the secretary of state, dated the 15th of November, 1810.

See the letter of Mr. Morier, British charge d'affaires, to the secretary of state, dated the 15th of Dec 1810; and the secretary's answer.

See the correspondence between Mr. Monroe, and Mr. Foster, the British minister, in the months of July, September, and November, 1811.

† See the letter of Mr. King, to the secretary of state, dated the 16th of May, 1803.

without
out of
of on
ships,
other
the d
which
sels, c
at first
dify,
that t
ing b
to be
minis
conve
claus
occas
juris
ries,
was c
Non
quies
still a
Briti
ingto
prom
upon
shoul
lar p
vess
had
A
thele
were
again
mori
estab
and
of a
rule,
in a
goro
the
the

48
S
Apri
ary
for f
t
4805

of fair and friendly

the United States to will be regarded by as to vindicate their reputations of the prince 1813, and not as a me- the insinuations of that prejudices, or vindict- that are past. The minate the war in Eu- ral sufferings of Ame- h respects, delusive and renewed between Great ere immediately follow- the belligerent powers al independence of the therefore, an interval se- r from the aggressions nature, the aggressions ey became incalculably ver, that the American utral and pacific policy, with the same good faith al, had distinguished its ose from the alternative stance. And if Great of the American declara- Britain alone had obsti- ociation.

anticipating the rupture had obtained assurances n the event of war, the ers should be drawn up general, that the rights of oderation, and with due in relation to the import- ually prepared for signa- ure and lord St. Vincent, years, declaring that "no upon the high seas, and to governor Claiborne, and the 10.

orida, transmitted to the secre- issippi territory, in his letter of of the secretary of state, dated

re (Affaires, to the secretary of secretary's answer:

roe, and Mr. Foster, the British and November, 1811. ary of state, dated the 16th of

without the jurisdiction of either party, be demanded or taken out of any ship or vessel, belonging to the citizens or subjects of one of the parties, by the public or private armed ships, or men of war, belonging to or in the service of the other party; and that strict orders should be given for the due observance of the engagement."† This convention, which explicitly relinquished impressments from American vessels, on the high seas, and to which the British ministers had, at first, agreed, lord St. Vincent was desirous afterwards to modify, "stating, that on further reflection, he was of opinion, that the narrow seas should be expressly excepted, they having been, as his lordship remarked, immemorially considered to be within the dominion of Great Britain." The American minister, however, "having supposed, from the tenor of his conversations with lord St. Vincent, that the doctrine of *mare clausum* would not be revived against the United States on this occasion; but that England would be content with the limited jurisdiction or dominion over the seas adjacent to her territories, which is assigned by the law of nations to other states, was disappointed, on receiving lord St. Vincent's communication and chose rather to abandon the negotiation than to acquiesce in the doctrine it proposed to establish."‡ But it was still some satisfaction to receive a formal declaration from the British government, communicated by its minister at Washington, after the recommencement of the war in Europe, which promised in effect, to reinstate the practice of naval blockades upon the principles of the law of nations; so that no blockade should be considered as existing, "unless in respect of particular ports, which might be actually invested, and then that the vessels bound to such ports should not be captured, unless they had previously been warned not to enter them."*

All the precautions of the American government were, nevertheless, ineffectual, and the assurances of the British government were, in no instance, verified. The outrage of impressment was again indiscriminately perpetrated upon the crew of every American vessel, and on every sea. The enormity of blockades established by an order in council, without a legitimate object, and maintained by an order in council, without the application of a competent force, was, more and more developed. The rule, denominated "the rule of the war of 1756" was revived in an affected style of moderation, but in a spirit of more rigorous execution† The lives, the liberty, the fortunes and the happiness of the citizens of the United States, engaged in the pursuits of navigation and commerce, were once more sub-

* See the letter of Mr. King, to the secretary of state, dated July 1803.

† See the letter of Mr. King, to the secretary of state, dated July, 1803.

‡ See the letter of Mr. Merry, to the secretary of state, dated the 12th of April, 1804, and the enclosed copy of a letter from Mr. Nepean, the secretary of the admiralty, to Mr. Hammond, the British under secretary of state for foreign affairs, dated Jan. 5, 1804.

† See the orders in council of the 24th June, 1803, and the 17th of Aug. 1805.

jected to the violence and cupidity of the British cruizers. And in brief, so grievous, so intolerable, had the affliction of the nation become, that the people, with one mind, and one voice, called loudly upon their government, for redress and protection; the congress of the United States, participating in the feelings and resentments of the time, urged upon the executive magistrate, the necessity of an immediate demand of reparation from Great Britain; while the same patriotic spirit which opposed British usurpation in 1793, and encountered French hostility in 1798, was again pledged in every variety of form, to the maintenance of the national honor and independence during the more arduous trial that arose in 1805.

Amidst these scenes of injustice on the one hand, and of reclamation on the other, the American government preserved its equanimity and its firmness. It beheld much in the conduct of France and of her ally Spain to provoke reprisals. It beheld more in the conduct of Great Britain, that led, unavoidably (as had often been avowed) to the last resort of arms. It beheld in the temper of the nation, all that was requisite to justify an immediate selection of Great Britain, as the object of a declaration of war. And it could not but behold in the policy of France, the strongest motive to acquire the United States, as an associate in the existing conflict. Yet these considerations did not then, more than at any former crisis, subdue the fortitude, or mislead the judgment of the American government; but in perfect consistency with its neutral, as well as its pacific system, it demanded attonement, by remonstrances with France and Spain; and it sought the preservation of peace, by negotiation with Great Britain.

It has been shown, that a treaty proposed, emphatically, by the British minister resident at Philadelphia, "as the means of drying up every source of complaint and irritation, upon the head of impressment," was deemed utterly inadmissible, by the American government, because it did not sufficiently provide for that object. It has, also, been shown, that another treaty, proposed by the American minister at London, was laid aside because the British government, while it was willing to relinquish, expressly, impressments from American vessels, on the high seas, insisted upon an exception, in reference to the narrow seas claimed as part of the British dominion; and experience demonstrated, that, although the spoliations committed upon the American commerce, might admit of reparation, by the payment of a pecuniary equivalent: yet, consulting the

* See the memorials of Boston, New-York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, &c. presented to congress in the end of the year 1805, and the beginning of the year 1806.

† See the resolutions of the senate of the United States, of the 10th and 14th of February, 1806; and the resolution of the house of representatives of the United States.

§ See Mr. Lister's letter to the secretary of state, dated the 4th of February, 1800; and the letter of Mr. Pickens, secretary of state, to the President of the United States, dated the 20th of February, 1800.

the British cruisers. And had the affliction of the one mind, and one voice, for redress and protection, participating in the urged upon the executive demand of reparation, the same patriotic spirit of 1793, and encountered edged in every variety of national honor and independence that arose in 1805.

On the one hand, and of the government preserved beheld much in the controversy provoke reprisals. It became certain, that led, unavoidable, the last resort of arms. It was all that was requisite to Britain, as the object did not but behold in the desire to acquire the United States. Yet these considerations, any former crisis, subjugation of the American navy with its neutral, and atonement, by remonstrance it sought the preservation of Britain.

Proposed, emphatically, by Philadelphia, "as the means of irritation, upon the head inadmissible," by the American sufficiently provide for, that another treaty, proposed, was laid aside because it was willing to relinquish American vessels, on the one hand, in reference to the narrowish dominion; and experience the spoliations committed at admit of reparation, by the United States; yet, consulting the

Philadelphia, Baltimore, &c. in 1805, and the beginning of the

United States. of the 10th and of the house of representatives

of state, dated the 4th of February, secretary of state, to the President, February, 1800.

honor and the feelings of the nation, it was impossible to receive satisfaction for the cruelties of impressment, by any other means, than by an entire discontinuance of the practice. When therefore the envoys extraordinary were appointed in the year 1806, to negotiate with the British government, every authority was given, for the purposes of conciliation; nay, an act of congress, prohibiting the importation of certain articles of British manufacture into the United States, was suspended, in proof of a friendly disposition; but it was declared, that "the suppression of impressment, and the definition of blockades, were absolutely indispensable;" and that, "without a provision against impressments, no treaty should be concluded." The American envoys, accordingly, took care to communicate to the British commissioners, the limitations of their powers. Influenced, at the same time, by a sincere desire to terminate the differences between the two nations; knowing the solicitude of their government, to relieve its seafaring citizens from actual sufferance; listening, with confidence, to assurances and explanations of the British commissioners in a sense favorable to their wishes; and judging from a state of information, that gave no immediate cause to doubt the sufficiency of those assurances and explanations; the envoys, rather than terminate the negotiation without any arrangement, were willing to rely upon the efficacy of a substitute, for a positive article in the treaty, to be submitted to the consideration of their government, as this, according to the declaration of the British commissioners, was the only arrangement, they were permitted, at that time, to propose, or to allow. The substitute was presented in the form of a note from the British commissioners to the American envoys, and contained a pledge, "that instructions had been given, and should be repeated and enforced, for the observance of the greatest caution in the impressing of British seamen; that the strictest care should be taken to preserve the citizens of the United States from any molestation or injury; and that immediate and prompt redress should be afforded, upon any representation of injury sustained by them."

Inasmuch, however, as the treaty contained no provision against impressment, and it was seen by the government, when the treaty was under consideration for ratification, that the pledge contained in the substitute was not complied with, but, on the contrary, that the impressments were continued, with undiminished violence, in the American seas, so long after the alleged date of the instructions, which were to arrest them; that the practical inefficacy of the substitute could not be doubted by the government here, the ratification of the treaty was necessarily declined; and it has since appeared, that after a change in the British ministry had taken place, it was declared by the secretary for foreign affairs, that no engagements were

* See the act of congress, passed the 18th of April, 1806; and the act suspending it, passed the 19th of December, 1806.

* See the note of the British commissioners, dated the 9th of Nov. 1806.

entered into, on the part of his majesty, as connected with the treaty, except such as appear upon the face of it.*

The American government, however, with unabating solicitude for peace, urged an immediate renewal of the negotiations on the basis of the abortive treaty, until this course was peremptorily declared, by the British government, to be "wholly inadmissible."†

But, independent of the silence of the proposed treaty, upon the great topic of American complaint, and of the view which has been taken of the projected substitute; the contemporaneous declaration of the British commissioners, delivered by the command of their sovereign, and to which the American envoys refused to make themselves a party, or to give the slightest degree of sanction, was regarded by the American government, as ample cause of rejection. In reference to the French decree, which had been issued at Berlin, on the 21st of November, 1806, it was declared that if France should carry the threats of that decree into execution, and, if "neutral nations, contrary to all expectation, should acquiesce in such usurpations, his majesty might probably be compelled, however reluctantly, to retaliate, in his just defence, and to adopt, in regard to the commerce of neutral nations with his enemies, the same measures, which those nations should have permitted to be enforced, against their commerce with his subjects;" "that his majesty could not enter into the stipulations of the present treaty, without an explanation from the United States of their intentions, or a reservation on the part of his majesty, in the case above mentioned, if it should even occur," and "that without a formal abandonment, or tacit relinquishment of the unjust pretensions of France, or without such conduct and assurances upon the part of the U. States, as should give security to his majesty that they would not submit to the French innovations, in the established system of maritime law, his majesty would not consider himself bound by the present signature of his commissioners to ratify the treaty, or precluded from adopting such measures as might seem necessary for counteracting the designs of the enemy."‡

The reservation of a power to invalidate a solemn treaty, at the pleasure of one of the parties, and the menace of inflicting punishment upon the United States for the offences of another nation, proved, in the event, a prelude to the scenes of violence which Great Britain was then about to display, and which it would have been improper for the American negotiators to anticipate. For, if a commentary were wanting to explain the real design of such conduct, it would be found in the fact, that within eight days from the date of the treaty, and before it was possible for the British government to have known the effect of

* See Mr. Canning's letter to the American envoys, dated 27th October, 1807.

† See the same letter.

‡ See the note of the British commissioners, dated the 31st of December 1806. See also the answer of Messrs. Munroe and Pinkney to the same.

as connected with the face of it.*

with unabating solicitude of the negotiations, this course was determined, to be "wholly

the proposed treaty, upon, and of the view which it presents; the contemporaneous, delivered by to which the American party, or to give the treaty by the American government. In reference to the treaty at Berlin, on the 21st of October, it is stated that if France should carry out its policy, and, if "neutral nations acquiesce in such course, they are compelled, however reluctant, and to adopt, in relations with his enemies, nations should have permitted to trade with his subjects;" "that the stipulations of the present treaty of the United States of their part of his majesty, in the event of such occurrence," and "that with the relinquishment of the United States, without such conduct and assurances, as should give security to the French inno- maritime law, his majesty by the present signature of the treaty, or precluded from adopting any necessary for counteracting

validate a solemn treaty, at and the menace of inflicting for the offences of another nation, to the scenes of violence out to display, and which it American negotiators to announce wanting to explain the real state of the fact, that with the treaty, and before it was possible to have known the effect of the treaty, dated 27th October,

oners, dated the 31st of December, 1806, and Pinkney to the same.

the Berlin decree on the American government; nay, even before the American government had itself heard of that decree, the destruction of American commerce was commenced by the order in council of the 7th January, 1807, which announced, "that no vessel should be permitted to trade from one port to another, both which ports should belong to, or be in possession of France, or her allies; or should be so far under their control, as that British vessels might not trade freely thereat."†

During the whole period of this negotiation which did not finally close until the British Government declared, in the month of October, 1807, that negotiation was no longer admissible, the course pursued by the British squadron, stationed more immediately on the American coast, was in the extreme, vexatious, predatory and hostile. The territorial jurisdiction of the United States, extending, upon the principles of the law of nations, at least a league over the adjacent ocean, was totally disregarded and contemned. Vessels employed in the coasting trade, or in the business of the pilot and fisherman, were objects of incessant violence; their petty cargoes were plundered; and some of their scanty crews were often either impressed, or wounded, or killed, by the force of British frigates. British ships of war hovered, in warlike display, upon the coast; blockaded the ports of the United States, so that no vessel could enter or depart in safety; penetrated the bays and rivers and even anchored in the harbors of the United States, to exercise a jurisdiction of impressment; threatened the towns and villages with conflagration, and wantonly discharged musketry, as well as cannon, upon the inhabitants of an open and unprotected country. The neutrality of the American territory was violated on every occasion; and, at last, the American government was doomed to suffer the greatest indignity which could be offered to a sovereign and independent nation, in the ever memorable attack of a British 50 gun ship, under the countenance of the British squadron, anchored within the waters of the United States, upon the frigate Chesapeake, peaceably prosecuting a distant voyage.‡ The British government affected from time to time to disapprove and condemn these outrages; but the officers who perpetrated them were generally applauded; if tried, they were acquitted; if removed from the American station, it was only to be promoted in another station; and if atonement were offered, as in the flagrant instance of the frigate Chesapeake, the atonement was so ungracious in the manner, and so tardy in the result, as to betray the want of that conciliatory spirit which ought to have characterized it.*

† See the order in council of January 7, 1807.

* See the evidence of these facts reported to congress in November 1806.

See the documents respecting capt. Love, of the *Driver*; captain Whitby, of the *Leander*, and captain

See also the correspondence respecting the frigate *Chesapeake*, with Mr. Canning at London; with Mr. Rose at Washington; with Mr. Erskine, at Washington; and with

But the American government, soothing the exasperated spirit of the people, by a proclamation, which interdicted the entrance of all British armed vessels, into the harbours and water of the United States,[†] neither commenced hostilities against Great Britain; nor sought a defensive alliance with France; nor relaxed in its firm but conciliatory efforts to enforce the claims of justice upon the honor of both nations.

The rival ambition of Great Britain and France, now, however, approached the consummation, which, involving the destruction of all neutral rights, upon an avowed principle of action, could not fail to render an actual state of war, comparatively, more safe, and more prosperous, than the imaginary state of peace, to which neutrals were reduced. The just and impartial conduct of a neutral nation, ceased to be its shield and its safeguard, when the conduct of the belligerent powers towards each other, became the only criterion of the law of war. The wrong committed by one of the belligerent powers, was thus made the signal for the perpetration of a greater wrong by the other; and if the American government complained to both powers, their answer, although it never denied the causes of complaint, invariably retorted an idle and offensive inquiry, into the priority of their respective aggressions; or each demanded a course of resistance against its antagonist, which was calculated to prostrate the American right of self-government, and coerce the United States, against their interest and their policy into becoming an associate in the war. But the American government never did, and never can, admit, that a belligerent power, "in taking steps to restrain the violence of its enemy, and to retort upon them the evils of their own injustice,"[‡] is entitled to disturb and destroy, the rights of a neutral power, as recognized and established, by the law of nations. It was impossible indeed, that the real features of the mis-called retaliatory system should be long masked from the world; when Great Britain, even in her acts of professed retaliation, declared that France was unable to execute the hostile denunciations of her decrees;[§] and when Great Britain herself, unblushingly, entered into the same commerce with her enemy (through the medium of forgeries, perjuries and licences) from which she had interdicted unoffending neutrals.—The pride of naval superiority; and the cravings of commercial monopoly; gave after all, the impulse and direction to the councils of the British cabinet; while the vast although visionary, projects of France, furnished occasions and pretexts, for accomplishing the objects of those councils.

The British minister, resident at Washington, in the year 1804, having distinctly recognized, in the name of his sovereign, the legitimate principles of blockade, the American government received, with some surprise and solicitude, the suc-

[†] See the proclamation of the 2nd of July, 1807.

[‡] See the orders in council of the 7th of January, 1807.

[§] See the orders in council of the 7th of January, 1807.

ing the exasperated
which interdicted the
to the harbours and
announced hostilities a-
sensive alliance with
iliatory efforts to en-
of both nations.

and France, now, how-
th, involving the de-
vowed principle of ac-
state of war, compara-
than the imaginary
duced. The just and
iased to be its shield
the belligerent powers
riterion of the law of
the belligerent powers,
petration of a greater
can government com-
though it never denied
sted an idle and offen-
pective aggressions;
against its antagonist,
merican right of self-go-
against their interest
ciate in the war. But
d never can, admit, that
o restrain the violence
he evils of their own in-
roy, the rights of a neu-
hed, by the law of na-
he real features of the
long masked from the
er acts of professed re-
able to execute the hos-
nd when Great Britain
ame commerce with her
ries, perjuries and licen-
unoffending neutrals.—
the cravings of commer-
alse and direction to the
the vast although vision-
asions and pretexts, for
uncile.

Washington, in the year
n the name of his sover-
cade, the American go-
se and solicitude, the suc-

cessive notifications of the 9th of August, 1804, the 8th of April, 1806, and more particularly, of the 16th of May, 1806, announcing, by the last notification, "a blockade of the coast, rivers, and ports, from the river Elbe to the port of Brest, both inclusive."⁴ In none of the notified instances of blockade, were the principles, that had been recognized in 1804, adopted and pursued, and it will be recollected by all Europe, that neither at the time of the notification, of the 16th of May, 1806; nor at the time of excepting the Elbe and Ems, from the operation of that notification; nor at any time, during the continuance of the French war, was there an adequate naval force, actually applied by Great Britain, for the purpose of maintaining a blockade from the river Elbe, to the port of Brest. It was then in the language of the day, "a mere paper blockade" a manifest infraction of the law of nations; and an act of peculiar injustice to the United States, as the only neutral power, against which it would practically operate. But whatever may have been the sense of the American government on the occasion; and whatever might be the disposition, to avoid making this the ground of an open rupture with Great Britain, the case assumed a character of the highest interest, when, independent of its own injurious consequences, France in the Berlin decree of the 21st of November, 1806, recited, as a chief cause for placing the British islands in a state of blockade, "that Great Britain declares blockaded, places before which she has not a single vessel of war; and even places which her united forces would be incapable of blockading; such as entire coasts, and a whole empire: an unequalled abuse of the right of blockade, that had no other object, than to interrupt the communications of different nations; and to extend the commerce and industry of England, upon the ruin of those nations."⁵ The American government aims not, and never has aimed, at the justification, either of Great Britain, or of France, in their career of crimination and recrimination: but it is of some importance to observe, that if the blockade of May, 1806, was an unlawful blockade, and if the right of retaliation arose with the first unlawful attack, made by a belligerent power upon neutral rights, Great Britain has yet to answer to mankind, according to the rule of her own acknowledgment, for all the calamities of the retaliatory warfare. France, whether right or wrong, made the British system of blockade, the foundation of the Berlin decree; and France had an equal right with Great Britain, to demand from the United States, an opposition to every encroachment upon the privileges of the neutral character. It is enough, however, on the present occasion, for the American government, to observe, that it possessed no power to prevent the framing of the Berlin decree, and to disclaim any

⁴ See Lord Harrowby's note to Mr. Munroe, dated the 9th of August, 1804, and Mr. Fox's notes to Mr. Munroe, dated respectively the 8th of April, and the 16th of May, 1806.

⁵ See Lord Howick's note to Mr. Munroe, dated the 25th of Sept. 1806. See the Berlin decree of the 21st of November, 1806.

approbation of its principles, or acquiescence in its operations: for, it neither belonged to Great Britain, nor to France, to prescribe to the American government, the time, or the mode, or the degree, of resistance, to the indignities, and the outrages, with which each of those nations, in its turn, assailed the United States.

But it has been shown, that after the British government possessed a knowledge of the existence of the Berlin decree, it authorized the conclusion of the treaty with the United States, which was signed at London, on the 31st of December, 1806, reserving to itself a power of annulling the treaty, if France did not revoke, or if the United States, as a neutral power, did not resist, the obnoxious measure. It has, also, been shown, that before Great Britain could possibly ascertain, the determination of the United States, in relation to the Berlin decree, the orders in council of the 7th of January, 1807, were issued, professing to be a retaliation against France, "at a time when the fleets of France and her allies were themselves confined within their own ports, by the superior valor and discipline of the British navy."† but operating, in fact, against the United States, as a neutral power, to prohibit their trade "from one port to another, both which ports should belong to, or be in the possession of, France or her allies, or should be so far under their control, as that British vessels might not trade freely thereat."‡ It remains, however, to be stated, that it was not until the 12th of March, 1807, that the British minister, then residing at Washington, communicated to the American government, in the name of his sovereign, the orders in council of January, 1807, with an intimation, that stronger measures would be pursued, unless the United States should resist the operations of the Berlin decree.§ At the moment the British government was reminded, "that within the period of those great events, which continued to agitate Europe, instances had occurred, in which the commerce of neutral nations, more especially of the United States, had experienced the severest distresses from its own orders and measures, manifestly unauthorized by the law of nations," assurances were given, "that no culpable acquiescence on the part of the United States would render them accessory to the proceedings of one belligerent nation, through their rights of neutrality, against the commerce of its adversary;" and the right of Great Britain to issue such orders, unless as orders of blockade, to be enforced according to the law of nations, was utterly denied.||

This candid and explicit avowal of the sentiments of the American government, upon an occasion so novel and important in the history of nations, did not, however, make its just im-

† See the order in council of the 7th January 1807.

‡ See Mr. Erskine's letter to the Secretary of state, dated the 12th of March, 1807.

§ See the secretary of state's letter to Mr. Erskine, dated the 20th of March, 1807.

pre
new
ly,
effi
ver
and
180
Fr
ma
tho
ed,
ma
san
san
the
cle
trie
ful
wit
ees
of
cor
pay
sit
dis
ind
sis
Th
at
cor
wa
ren
gov
tio
ass
dis
tru
per
da
sin
ed
tis
cla
exp
to
th
Un
ary
180

pression upon the British cabinet; for, without assigning any new provocation on the part of France, and complaining, merely, that neutral powers had not been induced to interpose, with effect, to obtain a revocation of the Berlin decree, (which, however, Great Britain herself had affirmed to be a decree nominal and inoperative) the orders in council of the 11th of November 1807, were issued, declaring, "that all the ports and places of France and her allies, or of any other country at war with his majesty, and all other ports or places in Europe, from which, although not at war with his majesty, the British flag was excluded, and all ports or places in the colonies belonging to his majesty's enemies, should, from thenceforth, be subject to the same restrictions, in point of trade and navigation, as if the same were actually blockaded by his majesty's naval forces, in the most strict and rigorous manner;" that "all trade in articles which were the produce or manufacture of the said countries or colonies, should be deemed and considered to be unlawful;" but that neutral vessels should still be permitted to trade with France from certain free ports, or through ports and places of the British dominions; To accept the lawful enjoyment of a right as the grant of a superior; to prosecute a lawful commerce, under the forms of favor and indulgence; and to pay a tribute to Great Britain for the privilege of a lawful transit on the ocean; were concessions which Great Britain was disposed, insidiously, to exact, by an appeal to the cupidity of individuals, but which the United States could never yield, consistently with the independence and sovereignty of the nation. The orders in council were, therefore, altered, in this respect, at a subsequent period; but the general interdiction of neutral commerce, applying more especially to American commerce, was obstinately maintained against all the force of reason, of remonstrance, and of protestation, employed by the American government, when the subject was presented to its consideration by the British minister residing at Washington. The fact assumed as the basis of the orders in council was unequivocally disowned; and it was demonstrated, that so far from its being true "that the United States had acquiesced in the illegal operation of the Berlin decree, it was not even true that at the date of the British orders of the 11th of November, 1807, a single application of that decree to the commerce of the United States, on the high seas, could have been known to the British government;" while the British government had been officially informed by the American minister at London, "that explanations, uncontradicted by any overt act, had been given to the American minister at Paris, which justified a reliance that the French decree would not be put in force against the United States."⁵

⁵ See the orders in council of the 11th of November, 1807.

⁶ See Mr. Canning's letter to Mr. Pinkney, 23d of February, 1808.

⁷ See Mr. Erskine's letter to the secretary of state, dated 22nd of February, 1808; and the answer of the secretary of state, dated 25th of March, 1808.

in its operations: to France, to pre-
e, or the mode,
es, and the out-
turn, assailed the
British government
e Berlin decree, it
the United States,
December, 1806,
e treaty, if France
neutral power, did
also, been shown,
ascertain, the deter-
the Berlin decree,
1807, were issued,
e, "at a time when
themselves confined
lor and discipline of
against the United
ir trade "from one
belong to, or be in
should be so far un-
right not trade freely
ed, that it was not
British minister, then
the American gov-
ne orders in council
at stronger measures
s should resist the o-
ment the British go-
period of those great
instances had occur-
tions, more especially
the severest distresses
y unauthorized by the
that no culpable acqui-
would render them ac-
erent nation, through
merce of its adversa-
such orders, unless
rding to the law of na-
e sentiments of the A-
so novel and important
ver, make its just im-

1807.
of state, dated the 12th of
Erskine, dated the 20th of

The British orders of the 11th of November, 1807, were quickly followed by the French decree of Milan, dated the 17th of December, 1807, "which was said to be resorted to, only in just retaliation of the barbarous system adopted by England," and in which the denationalizing tendency of the orders, is made the foundation of a declaration in the decree, "that every ship to whatever nation it might belong, that should have submitted to be searched by an English ship, or to a voyage to England, or should have paid, any tax whatsoever to the English government, was thereby, and for that alone, declared to be denationalized, to have forfeited the protection of its sovereign, and to have become English property, subject to capture as good and lawful prize: that the British Islands were placed in a state of blockade, both by sea and land—and every ship, of whatever nation, or whatever the nature of its cargo might be, that sails from ports of England, or those of the English colonies, and of the countries occupied by English troops, and proceeding to England, or to the English colonies, or to countries occupied by English troops, should be good and lawful prize: but that the provisions of the decree should be abrogated and null, in fact, as soon as the English should abide again by the principles of the law of nations, which are, also, the principles of justice and honor."[†] In opposition, however, to the Milan decree, as well as to the Berlin decree, the American government strenuously and unceasingly employed every instrument, except the instruments of war. It acted precisely to-

wards France as it acted towards Great Britain, on similar occasions; but France remained, for a time, as insensible to the claims of justice and honor as Great Britain, each imitating the other in extravagance of pretension and in obstinacy of purpose.

When the American government received intelligence that the orders of the 11th of November, 1807, had been under the consideration of the British cabinet, and were actually prepared for promulgation, it was anticipated that France, in a zealous prosecution of the retaliatory warfare, would soon produce an act of, at least, equal injustice and hostility. The crisis existed, therefore, at which the United States were compelled to decide either to withdraw their seafaring citizens, and their commercial wealth from the ocean, or to leave the interest of the mariner and the merchant exposed to certain destruction; or to engage in open and active war, for the protection and defence of those interests. The principles and the habits of the American government were still disposed to neutrality and peace. In weighing the nature and the amount of the aggressions which had been perpetrated, or which were threatened, if there were any preponderance to determine the balance, against one of the belligerent powers, rather than the other, as the object of a declaration of war; it was against Great Britain, at least, upon the vital interest of impressment; and the obvious superi-

[†] See the Milan decree of the 17th of December, 1807.

ember, 1807, were
 of Milan, dated the
 to be resorted to,
 system adopted by
 tendency of the
 tion in the decree,
 belong, that should
 ship, or to a voy-
 whatsoever to the
 that alone, declared
 protection of its sove-
 rty, subject to cap-
 tivity of the British
 Islands were
 and land—and every
 nature of its cargo
 or those of the En-
 by English troops,
 lish colonies, or to
 ld be good and law-
 res should be abro-
 lish should abide a-
 which are, also, the
 osition, however, to
 decree, the American
 employed every in-
 acted precisely to-
 on similar oc-
 as insensible to the
 ain, each imitating
 and in obstinacy of
 ved intelligence that
 had been under the
 vere actually prepar-
 France, in a zealous
 uld soon produce an
 y. The crisis existed,
 compelled to decide
 , and their commer-
 interest of the marin-
 estruction; or to en-
 ection and defence of
 bits of the American
 lity and peace. In
 he aggressions which
 threatened, if there
 balance, against one
 e other, as the object
 reat Britain, at least,
 and the obvious superi-

ority of her naval means of annoyance. The French decrees were, indeed, as obnoxious in their formation and design as the British orders; but the government of France claimed and exercised no right of impressment; and the maritime spoliation of France were comparatively restricted, not only by her own weakness on the ocean, but by the constant and pervading vigilance of the fleets of her enemy. The difficulty of selection, the indiscretion of encountering, at once, both of the offending powers; and, above all, the hope of an early return of justice, under the dispensations of the ancient public law, prevailed in the councils of the American government; and it was resolved to attempt the preservation of its neutrality and its peace; of its citizens, and its resources; by a voluntary suspension of the commerce and navigation of the United States. It is true, that for the minor outrages committed, under the pretext of the rule of war of 1756, the citizens of every denomination had demanded from their government, in the year 1805, protection and redress; it is true, that for the unparalleled enormities of the year 1807, the citizens of every denomination again demanded from their government protection and redress: but it is, also, a truth, conclusively established by every manifestation of the sense of the American people, as well as of their government, that any honorable means of protection and redress, were preferred to the last resort of arms. The American government might honorably retire, for a time, from a scene of conflict and collision; but it could no longer, with honor, permit its flag to be insulted, its citizens to be enslaved, and its property to be plundered, on the highway of nations.

Under these impressions, the restrictive system of the United States was introduced. In December, 1807, an embargo was imposed upon all American vessels and merchandise; on principles similar to those, which originated and regulated the embargo law, authorised to be laid by the president of the United States, in the year 1794: but soon afterwards, in the genuine spirit of the policy, that prescribed the measure, it was declared by law, "that in the event of such peace, or suspension of hostilities, between the belligerent powers of Europe, or such changes in their measures affecting neutral commerce, as might render that of the United States safe, in the judgment of the president of the United States, he was authorised to suspend the embargo, in whole or in part."¹ The pressure of the embargo was thought, however, so severe upon every part of the community, that the American government, notwithstanding the neutral character of the measure, determined upon some relaxation; and, accordingly, the embargo being raised, as to all other nations, a system of non-intercourse and non importation was substituted in March, 1809, as to Great Britain and France, which prohibited all voyages to the British or French

¹ See the act of congress, passed the 22nd of December, 1807.

² See the act of congress, passed the 22nd of April, 1809.

dominions, and all trade in articles of British or French product or manufacture.** But still adhering to the neutral and pacific policy of the government, it was declared, "that the president of the United States should be authorised in case either France, or Great Britain, should so revoke or modify, her edicts, as that they should cease to violate the neutral commerce of the United States, to declare the same by proclamation; after which the trade of the United States might be renewed with the nation so doing." These appeals to the justice and the interests of the belligerent powers proving ineffectual; and the necessities of the country increasing, it was finally resolved, by the American government, to take the hazards of a war; to revoke its restrictive system; and to exclude British and French armed vessels from the harbours and waters of the United States; but, again, emphatically to announce, that in case either Great Britain or France, should, before the third of March, 1811, so revoke, or modify, her edicts, as that they should cease to violate the neutral commerce of the United States; and if the other nation should not, within three months thereafter, so revoke, or modify her edicts in like manner, the provisions of the non intercourse and non-importation law should, at the expiration of three months be revived against the nation refusing or neglecting, to revoke, or modify its edict†.

In the course which the American government had hitherto pursued, relative to the belligerent orders and decrees, the candid foreigner, as well as the patriotic citizen, may perceive an extreme solicitude, for the preservation of peace; but in the publicity and impartiality, of the overture, that was thus spread before the belligerent powers, it is impossible, that any indication should be found, of foreign influence or control. The overture was urged upon both nations for acceptance, at the same time, and in the same manner; nor was an intimation withheld from either of them, that "it might be regarded by the belligerent first accepting it, as a promise to itself, and a warning to its enemy."‡ Each of the nations, from the commencement of the retaliatory system, acknowledged, that its measures were violations of public law; and each pledged itself to retract them, whenever the other should set the example.¶ Although the American government, therefore, persisted in its remonstrances against the original transgressions, without regard to the question of their priority, it embraced, with eagerness, every hope of reconciling the interests of the rival powers, with a performance of the duty which they owed to the neutral character of the United States: and when the British minister, residing at Washington,

** See the act of Congress passed the first day of March, 1809.

• See the 11th section of the last cited act of congress.

† See the act of congress, passed the first of May, 1810.

‡ See the correspondence between the secretary of state, and the American ministers at London and Paris.

¶ See the documents laid before congress from time to time by the president, and printed.

British or French pro-
g to the neutral and
lared, "that the pre-
porised in case either
ke or modify, her o-
ate the neutral com-
same by proclama-
States might be re-
appeals to the justice
proving ineffectual;
ing, it was finally re-
take the hazards of a
nd to exclude British
urs and waters of the
to announce, that in
ld, before the third
her edicts, as that
commerce of the U-
uld not, within three
er edicts in like man-
a and non-importation
tha be revived against
oke, or modify its o-

ernment had hitherto
and decrees, the can-
izen, may perceive an
peace; but in the pub-
that was thus spread
sible, that any indica-
e or control. The o-
ceptance, at the same
n intimation withheld
garded by the bellige-
self, and a warning to
the commencement of
at its measures were vi-
itself to retract them,
le. Although the A-
in its remonstrances a-
regard to the question
ness, every hope of re-
with a performance of
character of the United
residing at Washington,

of March, 1809:
congress.
ay, 1810.
ary of state, and the Ameri-
n time to time by the presi-

in the year 1809, affirmed in terms as plain, and as positive, as language could supply, "that he was authorized to declare, that his Britannic majesty's orders in council of January and November, 1807, will have been withdrawn, as respects the U. States, on the 10th day of June, 1809," the president of the U. States hastened, with approved liberality, to accept the declaration as conclusive evidence, that the promised fact would exist, at the stipulated period; and, by an immediate proclamation, he announced, "that after the 10th day of June next, the trade of the United States with Great Britain, as suspended by the non-intercourse law, and by the acts of congress laying and enforcing an embargo, might be renewed."§ The American government, neither asked, nor received, from the British minister, an exemplification of his powers; an inspection of his instructions; nor the solemnity of an order in council: but executed the compact, on the part of the United States, in all the sincerity of its own intentions; and in all the confidence, which the official act of their representative of his Britannic majesty, was calculated to inspire. The act, and the authority for the act, were, however, disavowed by Great Britain; and an attempt was made, by the successor of Mr. Erskine, through the aid of insinuations, which were indignantly repulsed, to justify the British rejection of the treaty of 1809, by referring to the American rejection of the treaty of 1806; forgetful of the essential points of difference, that the British government, on the former occasion, had been explicitly apprized by the American negotiators of their defect of power; and that the execution of the projected treaty had not, on either side, been commenced.¶

After this abortive attempt to obtain a just and honorable revocation of the British orders in council, the United States were again invited to indulge the hope of safety and tranquility, when the minister of France announced to the American minister at Paris, that in consideration of the act of the 1st of May, 1809, by which the congress of the United States "engaged to oppose itself to that one of the belligerent powers which should refuse to acknowledge the rights of neutrals, he was authorized to declare that the decrees of Berlin and Milan were revoked, and that after the 1st of November, 1810, they would cease to have effect; it being understood, that in consequence of that declaration, the English should revoke their orders in council, and renounce the new principles of blockade, which they had wished to establish; or that the United States, conformably to the act of congress, should cause their rights to be respected by the English."†† This declaration delivered by the official organ of the government of France, and in the presence, as it were, of the

§ See the correspondence between Mr. Erskine, the British minister, and the secretary of state on the 17th, 18th, and 19th of April, 1809; and the President's proclamation of the last date.

¶ See the correspondence between the secretary of state, and Mr. Jackson, the British minister.

†† See the duke de Cadore's letter to Mr. Armstrong dated the 5th of August, 1810.

French sovereign, was of the highest authority, according to all the rules of diplomatic intercourse; and, certainly, far surpassed any claim of credence, which was possessed by the British minister, residing at Washington, when the arrangement of the year 1809, was accepted and executed by the American government. The president of the United States, therefore, owed to the consistency of his own character, and to the dictates of a sincere impartiality, a prompt acceptance of the French overture; and, accordingly, the authoritative promise, that the fact should exist at the stipulated period, being again admitted as conclusive evidence of its existence, a proclamation was issued on the 2d of November, 1810, announcing "that the edicts of France had been so revoked, as that they ceased, on the 1st day of the same month, to violate the neutral commerce of the U. States; and that all the restrictions imposed by the act of congress, should then cease and be discontinued, in relation to France and her dependencies."†† That France, from this epoch, refrained from all aggressions on the high seas, or even in her own ports, upon the persons and the property of the citizens of the U. States, never was asserted; but, on the contrary, her violence and her spoliations have been unceasing causes of complaint. These subsequent injuries, constituting a part of the existing reclamations of the United States, were, always, however, disavowed by the French government; whilst the repeal of the Berlin and Milan decrees has, on every occasion, been affirmed; inasmuch that Great Britain herself, was, at last, compelled to yield to the evidence of the fact.

On the expiration of three months from the date of the president's proclamation, the non-intercourse and non importation law was, of course, to be revived against Great Britain, unless, during that period, her orders in council should be revoked.—The subject was, therefore, most anxiously and most steadily pressed upon the justice and the magnanimity of the British government; and even when the hope of success expired, by the lapse of the period prescribed in one act of congress, the United States opened the door of reconciliation by another act, which, in the year 1811, again provided, that in case, at any time, "G. Britain should so revoke or modify her edicts, as that they shall cease to violate the neutral commerce of the United States; the president of the United should declare the fact by proclamation; and that the restrictions, previously imposed, should, from the date of such proclamation, cease and be discontinued."* But, unhappily, every appeal to the justice and magnanimity of Great Britain was now, as heretofore, fruitless and forlorn. She had, at this epoch, impressed from the crews of American merchant vessels, peaceably navigating the high seas, not less than six thousand mariners, who claimed to be citizens of the United States, and who were denied all opportunity to verify their claims. She had seized and confiscated the commercial property

†† See the President's proclamation of the 2nd of November, 1810.
* See the act of congress, passed the 2nd of March, 1811.

authority, according to all
 certainly, far surpassed
 sed by the British mi-
 the arrangement of the
 the American govern-
 as, therefore, owed to
 and to the dictates of a
 ce of the French over-
 promise, that the fact
 again admitted as con-
 demnation was issued on
 "that the edicts of
 ceased, on the 1st day
 commerce of the U.
 sed by the act of con-
 tinued, in relation to
 France, from this o-
 the high seas, or even in
 the property of the
 asserted; but, on the
 have been unceasing
 injuries, constituting a
 United States, were, al-
 though government; whilst
 cess has, on every occa-
 at Britain herself, was,
 e of the fact.

on the date of the presi-
 and non importation
 Great Britain, unless,
 should be revoked.—
 sely and most steadily
 mity of the British go-
 success expired, by the
 of congress, the United
 by another act, which,
 case, at any time, "G.
 edicts, as that they shall
 the United States; the
 fact by proclamation;
 posed, should, from the
 discontinued."* But,
 magnanimity of Great
 and forlorn. She had,
 of American merchant
 cess, not less than six
 citizens of the United
 tunity to verify their
 e commercial property

of American citizens to an incalculable amount. She had united in the enormities of France, to declare a great proportion of the terraqueous globe in a state of blockade; chasing the American merchant flag effectually from the ocean. She had contemptuously disregarded the neutrality of the American territory, and the jurisdiction of the American laws, within the waters and harbors of the United States. She was enjoying the emoluments of a surreptitious trade, stained with every species of fraud and corruption, which gave to the belligerent powers, the advantages of peace, while the neutral powers were involved in the evils of war. She had, in short, usurped and exercised on the water, a tyranny similar to that, which her great antagonist had usurped and exercised upon the land. And, amidst all these proofs of ambition, and avarice, she demanded that the victims of her usurpations and her violence, should revere her as the sole defender of the rights and liberties of mankind.

When, therefore, Great Britain, in manifest violation of her solemn promises, refused to follow the example of France, by the repeal of her orders in council, the American government was compelled to contemplate a resort to arms, as the only remaining course to be pursued, for its honor, its independence, and its safety. Whatever depended upon the United States themselves, the United States had performed for the preservation of peace, in resistance of the French decrees, as well as of the British orders. What had been required from France in its relation to the neutral character of the United States, France had performed, by the revocation of its Berlin and Milan decrees. But what depended upon Great Britain for the purposes of justice, in the repeal of her orders in council, was withheld; and new evasions were sought, when the old were exhausted. It was, at one time, alleged, that satisfactory proof was not afforded, that France had repealed her decrees against the commerce of the United States; as if such proof alone were wanting, to ensure the performance of the British promise.† At another time, it was insisted, that the repeal of the French decrees, in their operation against the United States in order to authorise a demand for the performance of the British promise, must be total, applying equally to their internal, and their external effects; as if the United States had either the right or the power to impose upon France the law of her domestic institutions.‡ And it was, finally, insisted, in a despatch from lord Castlereagh to the British minister, residing at Washington, in the year 1812, which was officially communicated to the American government, "that the decrees of Berlin and Milan must not be repealed singly and specially, in relation to the United States; but must be repealed, also, as to all other neutral nations; and that in no less extent of a repeal of the French decrees, had the British government ever pledged itself to repeal the orders in

† See the correspondence between Mr. Pinkney and the British government.

‡ See the letters of Mr. Erskine.

council; as if it were incumbent on the United States, not only to assert her own rights, but to become the coadjutor of the British government, in a gratuitous assertion of the rights of all other nations.

The Congress of the United States could pause no longer.—Under a deep and afflicting sense of the national wrongs, and the national resentments—while they “postponed definitive measures with respect to France, in the expectation that the result of unclosed discussions between the American minister at Paris and the French government, would speedily enable them to decide, with greater advantage, on the course due to the rights, the interests, and the honor of our country;”^{*} they pronounced a deliberate and solemn declaration of war, between Great Britain and the United States, on the 18th of June, 1812.

But, it is in the face of all the facts which have been displayed in the present narrative, that the Prince Regent, by his declaration of January, 1813, describes the United States as the aggressor in the war. If the act of declaring war constitutes, in all cases, the act of original aggression, the United States must submit to the severity of the reproach; but if the act of declaring war may be more truly considered as the result of long suffering, and necessary self defence, the American government will stand acquitted, in the sight of Heaven, and of the world. Have the United States, then, enslaved the subjects, confiscated the property, prostrated the commerce, insulted the flag, or violated the territorial sovereignty of Great Britain—No: but, in all these respects, the United States had suffered, for a long period of years previously to the declaration of war, the contumely and outrage of the British government.—It has been said, too, as an aggravation of the imputed aggression, that the U. States chose a period for their declaration of war, when Great Britain was struggling for her own existence, against a power which threatened to overthrow the independence of all Europe; but it might be more truly said, that the United States, not acting upon choice, but upon compulsion, delayed the declaration of war, until the persecutions of Great Britain had rendered farther delay destructive and disgraceful. Great Britain had converted the commercial scenes of American opulence and prosperity, into scenes of comparative poverty and distress; she had brought the existence of the United States, as an independent nation, into question; and surely, it must have been indifferent to the United States, whether they ceased to exist as an independent nation, by her conduct, while she professed friendship, or by her conduct when she avowed enmity and revenge. Nor is it true, that the existence of Great Britain was in danger, at the epoch of the declaration of war. The American government uniformly entertained an opposite opinion; and, at all times, saw more to

[†] See the correspondence between the secretary of state and Mr. Foster, the British minister in June, 1812.

^{*} See the president's message of the 1st of June, 1812; and the report of the committee of foreign relations, to whom the message was referred.

the United States, not
come the coadjutor of the
tion of the rights of all

ould pause no longer.—
national wrongs, and
“postponed definitive
the expectation that the
the American minister
would speedily enable
on the course due to
of our country;”* they
laration of war, between
the 18th of June, 1812.
s which have been dis-
e Prince Regent, by his
the United States as the
clarer war constitutes,
sion, the United States
roach; but if the act of
sidered as the result of
e, the American govern-
of Heaven, and of the
, enslaved the subjects,
commerce, insulted the
nty of Great Britain.—
ted States had suffered,
y to the declaration of
e British government.—
ion of the imputed ag-
riod for their declaration
aggling for her own ex-
ned to overthrow the in-
ght be more truly said,
a choice, but upon com-
, until the persecutions
er delay destructive and
nverted the commercial
erity, into scenes of com-
nd brought the existence
nt nation, into question;
ent to the United States,
ependent nation, by her
, or by her conduct when
is it true, that the ex-
ger, at the epoch of the
overnment uniformly en-
t all times, saw more to

etary of state and Mr. Foster,
June, 1812; and the report of
ic message was referred.

apprehend for the United States, from her maritime power,
than from the territorial power of her enemy. The event has
justified the opinion and the apprehension. But what the Unit-
ed States asked, as essential to their welfare, and even as ben-
eficial to the allies of Great Britain, in the European war, G.
Britain, it is manifest, might have granted, without impairing
the resources of her own strength, or the splendour of her own
sovereignty; for her orders in council have been since revoked;
not, it is true, as the performance of her promise, to follow, in
this respect, the example of France, since she finally rested the
obligation of that promise upon a repeal of the French decrees,
as to all nations; and the repeal was only as to the United
States; nor as an act of national justice towards the United
States; but simply, as an act of domestic policy, for the special
advantage of her own people.

The British government has, also, described the war as a
war of aggrandisement and conquest, on the part of the Unit-
ed States; but where is the foundation for the charge? While
the American government employed every means to dissuade
the Indians, even those who lived within the territory, and were
supplied by the bounty of the United States, from taking any
part in the war,† the proofs were irresistible, that the enemy
pursued a very different course;‡ and that every precaution
would be necessary, to prevent the effects of an offensive alli-
ance between the British troops and the savages throughout the
northern frontier of the U. States. The military occupation
of Upper Canada was, therefore, deemed indispensable to the
safety of that frontier, in the earliest movements of the war, in-
dependent of all views of extending the territorial boundary of
the United States. But, when war was declared, in resentment
for injuries which had been suffered upon the Atlantic, what
principle of public law, what modification of civilized warfare,
imposed upon the U. States the duty of abstaining from the in-
vasion of the Canadas? It was there alone, that the United
States could place themselves upon an equal footing of milita-
rary force with Great Britain; and it was there that they
might reasonably encourage the hope of being able, in the pre-
secution of a lawful retaliation, “to restrain the violence of the
enemy, and to retort upon him the evils of his own injustice.”
The proclamations issued by the American commanders, on en-
tering Upper Canada, have, however, been adduced by the Bri-
tish negotiators at Ghent, as the proofs of a spirit of ambition
and aggrandisement, on the part of their government. In truth,
the proclamations were not only unauthorised and disapproved,
but were infractions of the positive instructions which had been
given, for the conduct of the war in Canada. When the gene-
ral commanding the north western army of the United States
received, on the 24th of June, 1812, his first authority to com-

† See the proceedings of the councils held with the Indians, during the
expedition under Brigadier General Hull, and the talk delivered by the
President of the U. States, to the six nations, at Washington on the 8th of
April, 1813.

‡ See the documents laid before congress, on the 13th of June, 1812.

mence offensive operations, he was especially told, that "he must not consider himself authorised to pledge the government to the inhabitants of Canada, further than assurances of protection in their persons, property and rights." And on the ensuing 1st of August, it was emphatically declared to him, "that it had become necessary, that he should not lose sight of the instructions of the 24th of June, as any pledge beyond that was incompatible with the views of the government."* Such was the nature of the charge of American ambition and aggrandizement, and such the evidence to support it.

The prince regent, has however, endeavored to add to these unfounded accusations, a stigma, at which the pride of the American government revolts. Listening to the fabrications of British emissaries; gathering scandals from the abuses of a free press; and misled, perhaps, by the asperities of a party spirit, common to all free government; he affects to trace the origin of the war to "a marked partiality, in palliating and assisting the aggressive tyranny of France; and "to the prevalence of such councils, as associated the United States, in policy with the government of that nation."† The conduct of the American government is now open to every scrutiny; and its vindication is inseparable from a knowledge of the facts. All the world must be sensible, indeed, that neither in the general policy of the late ruler of France, nor in his particular treatment of the United States, could there exist any political, or rational foundation, for the sympathies and associations, overt or clandestine, which have been rudely and unfairly suggested. It is equally obvious, that nothing short of the aggressive tyranny, exercised by Great Britain towards the United States, could have counteracted and controlled, those tendencies to peace and amity, which derived their impulse, from natural and social causes; combining the affections and interests of the two nations. The American government, faithful to that principle of public law, which acknowledges the authority of all governments established *de facto*; and conforming its practice, in this respect, to the example of Europe; has never contested the validity of the governments successively established in France; nor refrained from that intercourse with either of them, which the just interests of the United States required. But the British cabinet is challenged to produce, from the recesses of its secret, or of its public archives, a single instance of unworthy concessions, or of political alliance and combination, throughout the intercourse of the United States, with the revolutionary rulers of France. Was it the influence of French councils, that induced the American government to resist the pretensions of France, in 1793, and to encounter her hostilities in 1798? that led to the ratification of the British treaty in 1795; to the British negotiation in 1805, and to the convention with the British minister in 1809?

* See the letter from the Secretary of the war department, to brig. gen. Hull, dated the 24th of June and the 1st of August, 1812.

† See the British declaration to the 19th of January, 1813.

pecially told, that "he
pledge the government
than assurances of pro-
rights." And on the ensu-
declared to him, "that
d not lose sight of the in-
pledge beyond that was
verament." Such was
n ambition and aggran-
support it.

deavored to add to these
which the pride of the A-
g to the fabrications of
from the abuses of a free
perities of a party spirit,
fects to trace the origin
palliating and assisting
d "to the prevalence of
ed States, in policy with
conduct of the American
tutiny; and its vindication
ne facts. All the world
in the general policy of
ticular treatment of the
political, or rational foun-
tations, overt or clandes-
tinely suggested. It is e-
ne aggressive tyranny, ex-
United States, could have
dependencies to peace and ami-
natural and social causes;
of the two nations. The
t principle of public law,
all governments establish-
tice, in this respect, to the
the validity of the go-
n France; nor refrained
them, which the just in-

But the British cabinet
esses of its secret, or of its
worthy concessions, or of
oughout the intercourse
ionary rulers of France.
ls, that induced the Ame-
s of France, in 1793, and
that led to the ratification
British negotiation in
British minister in 1809 P

war department, to brig. gen.
ugust, 1812.
January, 1813.

that dictated the impartial overtures, which were made to G.
Britain, as well as to France, during the whole period of the
restrictive system? that produced the determination to avoid
making any treaty, even a treaty of commerce, with France,
until the outrage of the Rambouillet decree was repaired; that
sanctioned the repeated and urgent efforts of the American go-
vernment, to put an end to the war, almost as soon as it was
declared? or that, finally, prompted the explicit communica-
tion, which, in pursuance of instructions, was made by the A-
merican minister, at St. Petersburg, to the court of Russia,
stating, "that the principal subjects of discussion, which had
long been subsisting between the United States and France,
remained unsettled; that there was no immediate prospect, that
there would be a satisfactory settlement of them; but that,
whatever the event, in that respect, might be, it was not the in-
tention of the government of the United States, to enter into
any more intimate connexions with France; that the govern-
ment of the United States did not anticipate any event what-
ever, that could produce that effect; and that the American min-
ister was the more happy to find himself authorized by his go-
vernment to avow this intention, as different representations of
their views had been widely circulated, as well in Europe, as in
America."|| But, while every act of the American government
thus falsifies the charge of a subservency to the policy of
France, it may be justly remarked, that of all the governments,
maintaining a necessary relation and intercourse with that na-
tion, from the commencement to the recent termination, of the
revolutionary establishments, it has happened, that the govern-
ment of the United States, has least exhibited marks of conde-
scension and concession to the successive rulers. It is for Great
Britain, more particularly, as an accuser, to examine and explain
the consistency of the reproaches, which she has uttered against
the United States, with the course of her own conduct; with
her repeated negotiations, during the republican, as well as dur-
ing the imperial sway of France; with her solicitude to make
and to propose treaties; with her interchange of commercial
benefits, so irreconcilable to a state of war; with the almost tri-
umphant entry of a French ambassador into her capital, amidst
the acclamations of the populace; and with the prosecution, in-
stituted, by the orders of the king of Great Britain himself, in
the highest court of criminal jurisdiction in his kingdom, to
punish the printer of a gazette, for publishing a libel on the
conduct and character of the late ruler of France! Whatever
may be the source of these symptoms, however they may indi-
cate a subservient policy, such symptoms have never occurred
in the United States, throughout the imperial government of
France.

|| See the instructions from the secretary of state to the American minister
at Paris, dated the 29th May, 1812.

|| See Mr. Munroe's letter to Mr. Adams, dated the 1st of July 1812; and
Mr. Adams's letter to Mr. Munroe dated the 11th December, 1812.

The conduct of the United States, from the moment of declaring the war, will serve as well as their previous conduct, to rescue them from the unjust reproaches of Great Britain. When war was declared, the orders in council had been maintained, with inexorable hostility, until a thousand American vessels with their cargoes had been seized and confiscated, under their operation; the British minister at Washington had, with peculiar solemnity, announced that the orders would not be repealed, but upon conditions, which the American government had not the right, nor the power, to fulfil; and the European war, which had raged, with little intermission for twenty years, threatened an indefinite continuance. Under these circumstances, a repeal of the orders, and a cessation of the injuries, which they produced, were events beyond all rational anticipation. It appears, however, that the orders, under the influence of a parliamentary inquiry into their effects upon the trade and manufactures of Great Britain, were provisionally repealed on the 23d of June, 1812, a few days subsequent to the American declaration of war. If this repeal had been made known to the United States, before their resort to arms, the repeal would have arrested it; and that cause of war being removed, the other essential cause, the practice of impressment, would have been the subject of renewed negotiation, under the auspicious influence of a partial, yet important act of reconciliation. But the declaration of war, having announced the practice of impressment, as a principal cause, peace could only be the result of an express abandonment of the practice or a suspension of the practice, for the purposes of negotiation; or of a cessation of actual sufferance, in consequence of a pacification in Europe, which would deprive Great Britain of every motive for continuing the practice.

Hence when early intimations, were given, from Halifax and from Canada, of a disposition, on the part of the local authorities to enter into an armistice, the power of those authorities was so doubtful, the objects of the armistice were so limited, and the immediate advantages of the measure were so entirely on the side of the enemy, that the American government could not, consistently with its duty, embrace the proposition.* But some hope of an amicable adjustment was inspired, when a communication was received from admiral Warren, in September, 1812, stating that he was commanded by his government, to propose on the one hand "that the government of the United States should instantly recal their letters of marque and reprisal against British ships, together with all orders and instructions for any acts of hostility, whatever against the territories

* See the letters of the department of state, to Mr. Russell, dated the 9th and 10th of August, 1812, and Mr. Graham's memorandum of a conversation with Mr. Baker, the British secretary of legation, enclosed in the last letter. See also Mr. Munroe's letter to Mr. Russell, dated the 21st of August, 1812.

in the moment of de-
 sir previous conduct, to
 s of Great Britain.
 ouncil had been main-
 thousand American
 and confiscated, un-
 at Washington had,
 the orders would not
 the American govern-
 o fulfil; and the Eu-
 intermission for twen-
 nuance. Under these
 a cessation of the in-
 beyond all rational an-
 orders, under the in-
 their effects upon the
 were provisionally re-
 lays subsequent to the
 peal had been made
 resort to arms, the
 cause of war being re-
 practice of impressment,
 negotiation, under the
 portant act of reconcilia-
 announced the practice
 ce could only be the re-
 practice of a suspension
 ociation; or of a cessa-
 of a pacification in Eu-
 n of every motive for

iven, from Halifax and
 art of the local authori-
 ver of those authorities
 ice were so limited, and
 ure were so entirely on
 can government could
 the proposition.* But
 is inspired, when a com-
 Warren, in September,
 by his government, to
 vernment of the United
 rs of marque and repri-
 all orders and instruc-
 r against the territories

to Mr. Russell, dated the 9th
 memorandum of a conversa-
 legation, enclosed in the last
 Russell, dated the 21st of Au-

of his majesty, or the persons or property of his subjects;" and
 to promise on the other hand, if the American government ac-
 quiesced in the preceeding proposition, that instructions should
 be issued to the British squadrons to discontinue hostilities a-
 gainst the United States and their citizens. This overture,
 however, was subject to a further qualification, "that should
 the American government accede to the proposal for terminat-
 ing hostilities, the British Admiral was authorised to arrange
 with the American government, as to the revocation of the laws
 which interdict the commerce and ships of war of Great Brit-
 ain from the harbours and waters of the United States; but
 that in default of such revocation within the reasonable period
 to be agreed upon, the orders in council would be revived."†—
 The American government, at once, at once expressed a dispo-
 sition to embrace the general proposition for a cessation of hos-
 tilities, with a view to negociation; declared that no peace could
 be durable, unless the essential object of impressment was ad-
 justed; and offered, as the basis of the adjustment, to prohibit
 the employment of British subjects in the naval or commercial
 service of the United States; but adhering to its determina-
 tion of obtaining a relief from actual sufrance, the suspension
 of the practice of impressment pending the proposed armistice,
 was deemed a necessary consequence; for, "it could not be pre-
 sumed, while the parties were engaged in a negociation to ad-
 just amicably this important difference, that the United States
 would admit the right, or acquiesce in the practice, of the oppo-
 site party; or that Great Britain would be unwilling restrain her
 cruizers from a practice which would have the strongest effect to
 defeat the negociation."‡ So just, so reasonable, so indispensable,
 a preliminary, without which the citizens of the United States,
 navigating the high seas, would not be placed, by the armistice,
 on an equal footing with the subjects of Great Britain, admiral
 Warren was not authorized to accept; and the effort at an amica-
 ble adjustment, through that channel, was necessarily abortive.

But long before the overture of the British admiral was made
 (a few days, indeed, after the declaration of war,) the reluc-
 tance with which the United States had resorted to arms, was
 manifested by the steps taken to arrest the progress of hostili-
 ties, and to hasten a restoration of peace. On the 26th of June
 1812, the American charge d'affairs at London, was instructed
 to make the proposal of an armistice to the British govern-
 ment, which might lead to an adjustment of all differences on
 the single condition, in the event of the orders in council being
 repealed, that instructions should be issued, suspending the
 practice of impressment during the armistice. This proposal
 was soon followed by another, admitting, instead of positive in-
 structions, an informal understanding between the two govern-

† See the letter of admiral Warren, to the secretary of state, dated at Hal-
 ifax the 29th of Sept. 1812.

‡ See the letter of Mr. Munroe, to admiral Warren, dated the 27th of
 October, 1812.

ments on the subject.¶ But both of these proposals were unhappily rejected.§ And when a third, which seemed to leave no plea for hesitation, as it required no other preliminary, than that the American minister at London, should find in the British government, a sincere disposition to accommodate the difference, relative to impressment, on fair conditions, was evaded, it was obvious, that neither a desire of peace, nor a spirit of conciliation, influenced the councils of Great Britain.

Under these circumstances the American government had no choice but to invigorate the war; and yet it has never lost sight of the object of all just wars, a just peace. The Emperor of Russia having offered his mediation to accomplish that object, it was instantly and cordially accepted by the American government;¶ but it was peremptorily rejected by the British Government. The Emperor, in his benevolence, repeated his invitation; the British government again rejected it. At last, however, Great Britain, sensible of the reproach, to which such conduct would expose her throughout Europe, offered to the American government, a direct negotiation for peace, and the offer was promptly embraced; with perfect confidence that the British government would be equally prompt in giving effect to its own proposal. But such was not the design or course of the British government. The American envoys were immediately appointed, and arrived at Gottenburg, the destined scene of negotiation, on the 11th of April, 1814, as soon as the season admitted. The British government, though regularly informed, that no time would be lost on the part of the United States, suspended the appointment of its envoys, until the actual arrival of the American envoys should be formally communicated. This pretension, however novel and inauspicious, was not permitted to obstruct the path to peace. The British government next proposed to transfer the negotiation from Gottenburgh to Ghent. This change, also, notwithstanding the necessary delay, was allowed. The American envoys arriving at Ghent, on the 24th of June, remained in a mortifying state of suspense and expectation for the arrival of the British envoys, until the 6th of August. And from the period of opening the negotiations, to the date of the last dispatch of the 31st of October, it has been seen that the whole of the diplomatic skill of the British government, has consisted in consuming time, without approaching any conclusion. The pacification of Paris had suddenly and unexpectedly placed at the disposal of the British government a great naval and military force; the pride and passions of the nation were artfully excited against the United States; and a war of desperate and barbarous character was

¶ See the letters from the secretary of state to Mr. Russell, dated the 26th of June and 27th of July, 1812.

§ See the correspondence between Mr. Russell, and Lord Castlereagh, dated August and September, 1812, and Mr. Russell's letters to the secretary of state, dated Sept. 1812.

¶ See the correspondence between Mr. Monroe and Mr. Daschkoff, in March, 1813.

proposals were un-
which seemed to leave
other preliminary,
on, should find in the
to accommodate the
r conditions, was eva-
peace, nor a spirit of
at Britain.

n government had no
it has never lost sight
The Emperor of Rus-
mplish that object, it
the American govern-
by the British Gov-
nce, repeated his in-
rejected it. At last,
proach, to which such
urope, offered to the
on for peace, and the
et confidence that the
mpt in giving effect to
design or course of the
ys were immediately
e destined scene of ne-
soon as the season ad-
h regularly informed,
f the United States,
until the actual arri-
rmally communicated.
uspicious, was not per-
the British government
from Gottenburgh to
ding the necessary de-
re arriving at Ghent,
fying state of suspense
tish envoys, until the
f opening the negocia-
the 31st of October, it
matic skill of the Brit-
ing time, without ap-
tion of Paris had sud-
posal of the British go-
ce; the pride and pas-
ed against the United
rbarous character was

Mr. Russel, dated the 26th
bell, and Lord Castlereagh,
Russell's letters to the secreta-
roe and Mr. Daschkoff, in

planned, at the very moment that the American government, finding its maritime citizens relieved, by the course of events, from actual suzerainty, under the practice of impressment, had authorized its envoys to waive those stipulations upon the subject, which might otherwise have been indispensable precautions.

Hitherto the American government has shewn the justice of its cause; its respect for the rights of other nations; and its inherent love of peace. But the scenes of war will also exhibit a striking contrast, between the conduct of the United States, and the conduct of Great Britain. The same insidious policy which taught the prince regent to describe the American government as the aggressor in the war, has induced the British government (clouding the daylight, truth, of the transaction) to call the atrocities of the British fleets and armies, a retaliation upon the example of the American troops in Canada. The United States tender a solemn appeal to the civilized world, against the fabrication of such a charge; and they vouch, in support of their appeal, the known morals, habits and pursuits of their people; the character of their civil and political institutions; and the whole career of their navy and their army, as humane, as it is brave. Upon what pretext did the British admiral, on the 18th of August, 1814, announce his determination, "to destroy and lay waste such towns and districts upon the coast as might be found assailable?"* It was the pretext of a request from the governor general of the Canadas, for aid to carry into effect measures of retaliation; while in fact, the barbarous nature of the war had been deliberately settled and prescribed by the British cabinet. What could have been the foundation of such a request? The outrages and irregularities which too often occur during a state of national hostilities, in violation of the laws of civilized warfare, are always to be lamented, disavowed and repaired, by a just and honourable government; but if disavowal be made, and if reparation be offered, there is no foundation for retaliatory violence. "Whatever unauthorised irregularity may have been committed by any of the troops of the United States, the American government has been ready, upon principles of sacred and eternal obligation, to disavow, and as far as it might be practicable, to repair.† In every known instance (and they are few) the offenders have been subjected to the regular investigation of a military tribunal; and an officer, commanding a party of stragglers, who were guilty of unworthy excesses, was immediately dismissed without the form of a trial, for not preventing those excesses. The destruction of the village of Newark, adjacent to Fort George, on the 10th of December, 1813, was long subsequent to the pillage and conflagration committed on the shores

* See admiral Cochrane's letter to Mr. Monroe, dated the 18th of August 1814; and Mr. Monroe's answer of the 6th September, 1814.

† See the letter from the secretary of war to brigadier general McLure, dated 4th of October, 1813.

of the Chesapeake, throughout the summer of the same year and might fairly have been alleged as a retaliation for those outrages; but, in fact, it was justified by the American commander, who ordered it, on the ground, that it became necessary to the military operations at that place; and while the American government, as soon as it heard of the act, on the 6th of January, 1814, instructed the general commanding the northern army, "to disavow the conduct of the officer who committed it, and to transmit to governor Prevost, a copy of the order, under colour of which that officer had acted." This disavowal was accordingly communicated; and on the 10th of February, 1814, Gov. Prevost answered, "that it had been with great satisfaction, he had received the assurance, that the perpetration of the burning the town of Newark, was both unauthorised by the American government, and abhorrent to every American feeling; that if any outrages had ensued the wanton and unjustifiable destruction of Newark, passing the bounds of just retaliation, they were to be attributed, to the influence of irritated passions, on the part of the unfortunate sufferers by that event which, in a state of active warfare, it has not been possible altogether to restrain; and that it was as little congenial to the disposition of his majesty's government, as it was to that of the government of the United States, deliberately to adopt any plan of policy, which had for its object the devastation of private property." But the disavowal of the American government was not the only expiation of the offence committed by its officer; for the British government assumed the province of redress in the indulgence of its own vengeance. A few days after the burning of Newark, the British and Indian troops crossed the Niagara, for this purpose; they surprized and siezed fort Niagara and put its garrison to the sword; they burnt the villages of Lewistown, Manchester, Tuscarora, Buffalo and Black Rock; slaughtering and abusing the unarmed inhabitants; until, in short, they had laid waste the whole of the Niagara frontier, levelling every house and every hut, and dispersing, beyond the means of shelter, in the extremity of winter, the male and the female the old and the young. Sir George Prevost, himself appears to have been sated with the ruin, and the havoc, which had been thus inflicted. In his proclamation of the 12th of January, 1814, he emphatically declared, that for the burning of Newark, "the opportunity of punishment had occurred, and a full measure of retaliation had taken place;" and "that it was not his intention to pursue further a system of warfare, so revolting to his own feelings, and so little congenial to the British character, unless the future measures of the enemy should

* Gen. McLure's letters to the secretary of war, dated Dec. 10 and 13, 1813.

† See the letter from the secretary at war to major general Wilkinson, dated the 26th of January 1814.

‡ See the letter of major general Wilkinson to sir George Prevost, dated the 28th of January, 1814, and the answer of Sir George Prevost, on the 10th of February, 1814.

com
the
copy
as to
py to
the
part
of th
Cana
prin
ed a
com
the
of th
never
ly di
arm
that
may
ry o
the
rang
neith
It
war
Stat
men
ing
usag
mors
a sh
tions
bloo
iarie
mies
unfo
merc
ploit
priv
coast
the
have
pred
tion

* S
Janu
† S
of Fe
1814
‡ S
ber, 1

mer of the same year
retaliation for those
by the American com-
that it became necessa-
ee; while the Ameri-
the act, on the 6th of
commanding the north-
the officer who commit-
et, a copy of the order,
cted."|| This disavow-
on the 10th of Februar-
it had been with great
ce, that the perpetration
ent to every American
the wanton and unjusti-
e bounds of just retali-
e influence of irritated
sufferers by that event
not been possible alto-
little congenial to the
as it was to that of the
ately to adopt any plan
devastation of private
American government
committed by its officer;
the province of redress
A few days after the
Indian troops crossed the
ted and sieged fort Nia-
they burnt the villages
Buffalo and Black Rock;
inhabitants; until, in
of the Niagara frontier,
and dispersing, beyond the
winter, the male and the
George Prevost, himself
in, and the havoc, which
nation of the 12th of Jan-
that for the burning of
ent had occurred, and a
place;" and "that it was
system of warfare, so re-
is congenial to the Brit-
ures of the enemy should

of war, dated Dec. 10 and 13,
to major general Wilkinson,
to Sir George Prevost, dated
of Sir George Prevost, on the

compel him again to resort to it."* Nay, with his answer to the American general, already mentioned, he transmitted "a copy of that proclamation, as expressive of the determination, as to his future line of conduct;" and added, "that he was happy to learn, that there was no probability, that any measures on the part of the American government would oblige him to depart from it."† Where then shall we search for the foundation of the call upon the British admiral, to aid the governor of Canada in measures of retaliation? Great Britain forgot the principles of retaliation, when her orders in council were issued against the unoffending neutral, in resentment of outrages committed by her enemy; and surely, she had again forgotten the same principle, when, she threatened an unceasing violation of the laws of civilized warfare, in retaliation for injuries which never existed, or which the American government had explicitly disavowed, or which had been already avenged by her own arms, in a manner and a degree, cruel and unparalleled. The American government after all, has not hesitated to declare, that "for the reparation of injuries, of whatever nature they may be, not sanctioned by the law of nations, which the military or naval force of either power might have committed against the other, it would always be ready to enter into reciprocal arrangements; presuming that the British government would neither expect, nor propose, any which were not reciprocal."‡

It is now, however, proper to examine the character of the warfare, which Great Britain has waged against the United States. In Europe, it has already been marked with astonishment and indignation, as a warfare of the tomahawk, the scalping knife and the torch; as a warfare, incompatible with the usages of civilized nations; as a warfare, that, disclaiming all moral influence, inflicts an outrage upon social order, and gives a shock to the very elements of humanity. All belligerent nations can form alliances with the savage, the African and the blood hound; but what civilized nation has selected these auxiliaries, in its hostilities? It does not require the fleets and armies of Great Britain to lay waste an open country; to burn unfortified towns, or unprotected villages; nor to plunder the merchant, the farmer and the planter of his stores—these exploits may easily be achieved by a single cruiser, or a petty privateer; but when have such exploits been performed on the coasts of the continent of Europe, or of the British Islands, by the naval and military force of any belligerent power; or when have they been tolerated by any honourable government, as the predatory enterprise of armed individuals? Nor, is the destruction of the public edifices, which adorn the metropolis of a

* See Sir George Prevost's proclamation, dated at Quebec, on the 12th of January, 1814.

† See the letter of Sir George Prevost to gen. Wilkinson, dated the 10th of February, 1814; and the British general orders, of the 22d of February, 1814.

‡ See Mr. Monroe's letter to admiral Cochrane, dated the 6th of September, 1814.

country, and serve to commemorate the taste and science of the age, beyond the sphere of action of the vilest incendiary, as well as the most triumphant conqueror. It cannot be forgotten, indeed, that in the course of ten years past, the capitals of the principal powers of Europe have been conquered, and occupied alternately, by the victorious armies of each other; and yet there has been no instance of a conflagration of the palaces, the temples or the halls of justice. No; such examples have proceeded from Great Britain alone; a nation so elevated in its pride; so awful in its power; and so affected in its tenderness for the liberties of mankind! The charge is severe, but let the facts be adduced.

1. Great Britain has violated the principles of social law, by insidious attempts, to excite the citizens of the United States into acts of contumacy, treason and revolt, against their government. For instance:

No sooner had the American government imposed the restrictive system upon its citizens, to escape from the rage and depredations of the belligerent powers, than the British government then professing amity towards the United States, issued an order, which was in effect, an invitation to the American citizens to break the laws of their country, under a public promise of British protection and patronage, "to all vessels which should engage in an illicit trade, without bearing the customary ship's documents and papers."[†]

Again: During a period of peace, between the U. States and Great Britain, in the year 1809, the governor general of the Canadas employed an agent (who had previously been engaged in a similar service with the knowledge and approbation of the British cabinet) "on a secret and confidential mission," into the United States declaring, "that there was no doubt, that his able execution of such a mission, would give him a claim, not only on the governor general, but on his majesty's ministers." The object of the mission, was to ascertain, whether there existed a disposition in any portion of the citizens, "to bring about a separation of the Eastern States from the general union; and how far in such an event, they would look up to England for assistance, or be disposed to enter into a connexion with her." The agent was instructed to insinuate, that if any of the citizens should wish to enter into a communication with the British government, through the governor general, he was authorised to receive such communication; and that he would safely transmit it to the governor general.[‡] He was accredited by a formal instrument, under the seal and signature of the governor general to be produced, "if he saw good ground for expecting, that the doing so might lead to a more confidential

* See Mr. Monroe's letter to Admiral Cochrane, dated the 6th of September, 1814.

† See the instructions to the commanders of British ships of war and privateers, dated the 11th of April, 1808.

‡ See the letter from Mr. Ryland, the secretary of the governor general, to Mr. Henry, dated the 26th of January, 1809.

taste and science of the vilest incendiary, as well cannot be forgotten, in that, the capitals of the conquered, and occupied each other; and yet the destruction of the palaces, the such examples have proportion so elevated in its effected in its tenderness is severe, but let the

principles of social law, by means of the United States revolt, against their gov-

ernment imposed the escape from the rage and the British goods the United States, is invitation to the American country, under a public age, "to all vessels which not bearing the customa-

between the U. States the governor general of had previously been acknowledged and approbation and confidential mission," at there was no doubt, mission, would give him a trial, but on his majesty's was to ascertain, whether the portion of the citizens, "to the States from the government, they would look up to enter into a connection to insinuate, that if into a communication the governor general, he location; and that he would general."† He was accredited and signature of the he saw good ground for and to a more confidential

ane, dated the 6th of Septem-

of British ships of war and

etary of the governor general, 1809.

40
communication, than he could otherwise look for; and he was furnished with a cypher "for carrying on the secret correspondence."‡ The virtue and patriotism of the citizens of the United States were superior to the arts and corruption employed in this secret and confidential mission, if it ever was disclosed to any of them; and the mission itself terminated as soon as the arrangement with Mr. Erskine was announced.— But, in the act of recalling the secret emissary, he was informed "that the whole of his letters were transcribing to be sent home, where they could not fail of doing him great credit, and it was hoped they might eventually contribute to his permanent advantage."§ To endeavor to realize that hope, the emissary proceeded to London; all the circumstances of his mission were made known to the British minister; his services were approved and acknowledged; and he was sent to Canada for a reward; with a recommendatory letter from Lord Liverpool to Sir George Prevost, "stating his lordship's opinion of the ability and judgment which Mr. Henry had manifested on the occasions mentioned in his memorial, (his secret and confidential mission) and of the benefit the public service might derive from his active employment, in any public situation in which Sir George Prevost might think proper to place him."¶ The world will judge upon these facts, and the rejection of a parliamentary call for the production of the papers relating to them, what credit is due to the prince regent's assertion, "that Mr. Henry's mission was undertaken without the authority or even knowledge of his majesty's government." The first mission was certainly known to the British government, at the time it occurred; for the secretary of the governor general expressly states, "that the information and political observations heretofore received from Mr. Henry, were transmitted by his excellency to the secretary of state, who had expressed his particular approbation of them."* the second mission was approved when it was known; and it remains for the British government to explain, upon any established principles of morality and justice the essential difference between ordering the offensive acts to be done; and reaping the fruit of those acts, without either expressly or tacitly condemning them.

Again: These hostile attempts upon the peace and union of the U. S. preceding the declaration of war, have been followed by similar machinations, subsequent to that event. The governor general of the Canadas has endeavored, occasionally, in his proclamations and general orders, to dissuade the militia of the U. S. from the performance of the duty which they owed

† See the letter of Sir James Craig, to Mr. Henry, dated Feb. 6, 1809.

§ See the same letter, and Mr. Ryland's letter of the 26th of January, 1809.

* See Mr. Ryland's letter, dated the 26th of June, 1809.

¶ See the letter from Lord Liverpool to Sir George Prevost, dated the 26th of September, 1811.

* See Mr. Ryland's letter of the 26th of January, 1809.

to their injured country ; and the efforts at Quebec and Halifax to kindle the flame of civil war, have been as incessant as they have been insidious and abortive. Nay, the governor of the island of Barbadoes, totally forgetful of the boasted article of the British magna charta, in favor of foreign merchants found within the British dominions, upon the breaking out of hostilities, resolved that every American merchant within his jurisdiction at the declaration of war, should, at once, be treated as a prisoner of war ; because every citizen of the United States was enrolled in the militia ; because the militia of the U. States were required to serve their country beyond the limits of the state to which they particularly belonged ; and because the militia of " all the states which had acceded to this measure were, in the view of sir George Beckwith, acting as a French conscription."†

Again : Nor was this course of conduct confined to the colonial authorities. On the 26th of October, 1812, the British government issued an order in council authorising the governors of the British West India islands to grant licenses to American vessels, for the importation and exportation of certain articles enumerated in the order ; but, in the instructions which accompanied the order, it was expressly provided, that " whatever importations were proposed to be made from the U. States of America should be by licenses confined to the ports in the eastern states exclusively, unless there was reason to suppose, that the object of the order would not be fulfilled, if licenses were not granted for importations from the other ports in the United States."‡

The president of the United States has not hesitated to place before the nation, with expressions of a just indignation, " the policy of Great Britain thus proclaimed to the world ; introducing into her modes of warfare, a system equally distinguished by the deformity of its features, and the depravity of its character ; and having for its object to dissolve the ties of allegiance, and the sentiments of loyalty, in the adversary nation ; and to seduce and separate its component parts, the one from the other."||

2. Great Britain has violated the laws of humanity and honor, by seeking alliances in the prosecution of the war, with savages, pirates, and slaves.

The British agency, in exciting the Indians at all times to commit hostilities upon the frontier of the United States, is too notorious to admit of a direct and general denial. It has sometimes, however, been said, that such conduct was unauthorized by the British government ; and the prince regent, seizing the single instance of an intimation alledged to be given on the part

† See the remarkable state paper issued by governor Beckwith, at Barbadoes, on the 1st of November, 1812.

‡ See the proclamation of the governor of Bermuda, dated the 14th of January, 1814 ; and the instructions from the British secretary of foreign affairs, dated Nov. 9, 1812.

|| See the message from the president to congress, dated the 24th of February, 1813.

at Quebec and Halifax
 en as incessant as they
 e governor of the island
 uted article of the Bri-
 merchants found within
 g out of hostilities, re-
 within his jurisdiction
 be treated as a prison-
 e United States was en-
 of the U. States were
 he limits of the state to
 ecause the militia of "all
 asure were, in the view
 ench conscription."†
 uct confined to the colo-
 er, 1812, the British go-
 v. authorising the governors
 ant licenses to American
 ation of certain articles
 instructions which accom-
 rovided, that "whatever
 le from the U. States of
 to the ports in the east-
 s reason to suppose, that
 fulfilled, if licenses were
 other ports in the Unit-

has not hesitated to place
 a just indignation, "the
 d to the world; introduc-
 em equally distinguished
 the depravity of its char-
 dissolve the ties of allegi-
 the adversary nation; and
 parts, the one from the

aws of humanity and hom-
 ition of the war, with sa-

the Indians at all times to
 f the United States, is too
 ernal denial. It has some-
 conduct was unauthorised
 prince regent, seizing the
 ed to be given on the part
 y governor Beckwith, at Bar-

of Bermuda, dated the 14th of
 the British secretary of foreign
 congress, dated the 24th of Feb-

of sir James Craig, governor of the Canadas, that an attack
 was meditated by the Indians, has affirmed, that "the charge
 of exciting the Indians to offensive measures against the Unit-
 ed States was void of foundation; that before the war began, a
 policy the most opposite had been uniformly pursued; and that
 proof of this was tendered by Mr. Foster to the American govern-
 ment."‡ But is it not known in Europe as well as in America,
 that the British North-west Company maintain a constant inter-
 course of trade and council with the Indians; that their interests
 are often in direct collision with the interests of the inhabitants of
 the United States, and that by means of the inimical disposi-
 tions and the active agencies of the company (seen, understood,
 and tacitly sanctioned by the local authorities of Canada) all the
 evils of an Indian war may be shed upon the U. States, without
 the authority of a formal order, emanating immediately from
 the British government? Hence, the American government,
 in answer to the evasive protestations of the British minister
 residing at Washington, frankly communicated the evidence of
 British agency, which had been received at different periods
 since the year 1807; and observed, "that whatever may have
 been the disposition of the British government, the conduct of
 its subordinate agents had tended to excite the hostility of the
 Indian tribes towards the United States; and that in estimating
 the comparative evidence on the subject, it was impossible not
 to recollect the communication lately made respecting the con-
 duct of sir James Craig in another important transaction (the
 employment of Mr. Henry as an accredited agent, to alienate
 and detach the citizens of a particular section of the Union
 from their government) which, it appeared, was approved by
 Lord Liverpool."§

The proof, however, that the British agents and military offi-
 cers were guilty of the charge thus exhibited, become conclu-
 sive, when subsequent to the communication which was made
 to the British minister, the defeat and flight of general Proctor's
 army, on the of placed in the possession of the A-
 merican commander, the correspondence and papers of the Bri-
 tish officers. Selected from the documents which were obtain-
 ed upon that occasion, the contents of a few letters will serve
 to characterise the whole of the mass. In these letters, writ-
 ten by Mr. McKee the British agent, to colonel England, the
 commander of the British troops, superscribed "on his Majes-
 ty's service," and dated during the months of July and August,
 1794, the period of general Wayne's successful expedition a-
 gainst the Indians, it appears that the scalps taken by the In-
 dians were sent to the British establishment at the rapids of the

§ See the prince regent's declaration of the 10th of January, 1813.

See also Mr. Foster's letters to Mr. Monroe, dated the 20th December,
 1811, and the 7th and 8th of June, 1812; and Mr. Monroe's answer, dated
 the 9th of January, 1812, and the 10th of June, 1812, and the documents
 which accompany the correspondence.

‡ See Mr. Monroe's letter to Mr. Foster, dated the 10th of June, 1812.

Miami;* that the hostile operations of the Indians were concerted with the British agents and officers;† that when certain tribes of Indians "having completed the belts they carried with scalps and prisoners, and being without provisions, resolved on going home, it was lamented that his majesty's posts would derive no security from the late great influx of Indians into that part of the country, should they persist in their resolution of returning so soon;‡ that "the British agents were immediately to hold a council at the Glaze, in order to try if they could prevail on the Lake Indians to remain; but that without provisions and ammunition being sent to that place it was conceived to be extremely difficult to keep them together;§ and that "colonel England was making great exertions to supply the Indians with provisions."|| But the language of the correspondence becomes at length so plain and direct, that it seems impossible to avoid the conclusion of a governmental agency on the part of Great Britain, in advising, aiding, and conducting the Indian war, while she professed friendship and peace towards the U. States. "Scouts are sent (says Mr. M'Kee to colonel England,) to view the situation of the American army; and we now muster one thousand Indians. All the Lake Indians, from Sagana downwards, should not lose one moment in joining their brethren, as every accession of strength is an addition to their spirits."¶ And again: "I have been employed several days in endeavoring to fix the Indians, who have been driven from their villages and cornfields, between the fort and the bay. Swan Creek is generally agreed upon, and will be a very convenient place for the delivery of provisions, &c."** Whether, under the various proofs of the British agency, in exciting Indian hostilities against the United States, in a time of peace, presented in the course of the present narrative, the prince regent's declaration, that "before the war began, a policy the most opposite had been uniformly pursued," by the British government.†† is to be ascribed to a want of information, or a want of candor, the American government is not disposed, more particularly, to investigate.

But, independent of these causes of just complaint, arising in a time of peace, it will be found, that when the war was declared, the alliance of the British government with the Indians, was avowed, upon principles, the most novel, producing consequences the most dreadful.—The savages were brought into the war, upon the ordinary footing of allies, without regard to the

* See the letter of Mr. M'Kee to Col. England, dated the 2nd July, 1794.

† See the letter from the same to the same, dated the 5th of July, 1794.

‡ See the same letter.

§ See the same letter.

|| See the same letter.

¶ See the letter from Mr. M'Kee to Col. England, dated the 13th of August, 1794.

** See the letter from the same to the same, dated the 30th of August, 1794.

†† See the prince regent's declaration of the 10th of January, 1813.

f the Indians were con-
cers;† that when certain
belts they carried with
provisions, resolved on
majesty's posts would
at influx of Indians into
persist in their resolution
British agents were immedi-
in order to try if they
remain; but that without
to that place it was con-
cept them together;‡ and
great exertions to supply
the language of the corres-
and direct, that it seems
a governmental agency on
g, aiding, and conducting
friendship and peace to-
nt (says Mr. M-Kee to co-
n of the American army;
dians. All the Lake In-
ld not lose one moment in
ssion of strength is an ad-
: "I have been employed
e Indians, who have been
lds, between the fort and
agreed upon, and will be a
ry of provisions, &c."—
the British agency, in ex-
United States, in a time of
the present narrative, the
fore the war began, a poli-
mly pursued," by the Bri-
to a want of information,
government is not disposed,

of just complaint, arising
that when the war was de-
government with the Indians,
most novel, producing conse-
quences were brought into the
allies, without regard to the

England, dated the 2nd July, 1794.
me, dated the 5th of July, 1794.

England, dated the 13th of Au-

the same, dated the 30th of August,

of the 10th of January, 1813.

inhuman character of their warfare; which neither spares age
nor sex; and which is more desperate towards the captive, at
the stake, than even towards the combatant, in the field. It
seemed to be a stipulation of the compact between the allies,
that the British might imitate, but should not control the fero-
city of the savages.—While the British troops behold, without
compunction, the tomahawk and the scalping knife, brandished
against prisoners, old men and children, and even against preg-
nant women, and while they exultingly accept the bloody scalps
of the slaughtered Americans;‡‡ the Indian exploits in battle, are
recounted and applauded by the British general orders. Rank
and station are assigned to them, in the military movements
of the British army; and the unhallowed league was ratified,
with appropriate emblems, by intertwining an American scalp,
with the decorations of the mace, which the commander of the
northern army of the United States found in the legislative
chamber of York, the capital of Upper Canada.

In the single scene, that succeeded the battle of Frenchtown,
near the river Raisin, where the American troops were defeated
by the allies, under the command of gen. Proctor, there will be
found concentrated upon indisputable proof, an illustration of the
horrors of the warfare, which G. Britain has pursued, and still
pursues, in co-operation with the savages of the south, as well
as with the savages of the north. The American army capitulat-
ed, on the 22d Jan. 1813; yet, after the faith of the British com-
mander had been pledged, in the terms of the capitulation; and
while the British officers and soldiers, silently and exultingly con-
templated the scene, some of the American prisoners of war
were tomahawked, some were shot and some were burnt. Many
of the unarmed inhabitants of the Michigan territory were mas-
sacred; their property was plundered, and their horses were
destroyed.¶¶ The dead bodies of the mangled Americans, were
exposed, unburied, to be devoured by dogs and swine: "because,
as the British officers declared, the Indians would not permit
the interment;"§§ and some of the Americans, who survived
the carnage, had been extricated from danger, only by being
purchased at a price, as a part of the booty belonging to the In-
dians. But, to complete this dreadful view of human depravi-
ty, and human wretchedness, it is only necessary to add, that
an American physician, who was despatched with a flag of
truce, to ascertain the situation of his wounded brethren, and
two persons, his companions, were intercepted by the Indians,

† See the letter from the American general Harrison to the British gen.
Proctor.

See a letter from the British Major Muir, Indian agent, to Col. Proctor
dated the 26th of September, 1812, and a letter from Col. St. George to Col.
Proctor, dated the 28th of October, 1812, found among Col. Proctor's pa-
pers.

‡‡ See the report of the committee of the house of Representatives, on the
31st of July, 1812; and the depositions and documents accompanying it.

§§ See the official report of Mr. Baker, the agent for the prisoners, to
Brig. Gen. Winchester, dated the 26th of February, 1813.

in their humane mission; the privilege of the flag was disregarded by the British officers; the physician, after being wounded, and one of his companions, were made prisoners; and the third person of the party was killed.^{¶¶}

But the savage, who had never known the restraints of civilized life, and the pirate who had broken the bonds of society, were alike the objects of British conciliation and alliance, for the purposes of an unparalleled warfare. A horde of pirates and outlaws had formed a confederacy and establishment on the island of Barrataria, near the mouth of the river Mississippi. Will Europe believe, that the commander of the British forces, addressed the leader of the confederacy, from the neutral territory of Pensacola, "calling upon him, with his brave followers, to enter into the service of Great Britain, in which he should have the rank of captain; promising that lands should be given to them all, in proportion to their respective ranks, on a peace taking place; assuring them, that their property should be guaranteed and their persons protected; and asking, in return, that they would cease all hostilities against Spain, or the allies of G. Britain, and place their ships and vessels, under the British commanding officer on the station, until the commander in chief's pleasure should be known, with a guarantee of their fair value at all events?"* There wanted only to exemplify the debasement of such an act, the occurrence, that the pirate should spurn the proffered alliance, and accordingly, Lafitte's answer was indignantly given, by a delivery of the letter, containing the British proposition, to the American governor of Louisiana.

There were other sources, however, of support, which Great Britain was prompted by her vengeance to employ, in opposition to the plainest dictates of her own colonial policy. The events, which have extirpated, or dispersed, the white population of St. Domingo, are in the recollection of all men. Although British humanity might not shrink, from the infliction of similar calamities upon the southern states of America, the danger of that course, either as an incitement to a revolt of the slaves in the British islands, or as a cause of retaliation, on the part of the United States, ought to have admonished her against its adoption. Yet, in a formal proclamation issued by the commander in chief of his Britannic majesty's squadrons, upon the American station, the slaves of the American planters were invited to join the British standard, in a covert phraseology, that afforded but a slight veil for the real design. Thus, admiral Cochrane, reciting, "that it had been represented to him, that many persons now resident in the United States, had expressed a desire to withdraw therefrom, with a view of entering into

^{¶¶} In addition to this description of savage warfare, under British auspices; see the facts contained in the correspondence between Gen. Harrison and Gen. Drummond.

* See the letter addressed by Edward Nichols, Lt. col. commanding his Britannic Majesty's force in the Florida's, to Monsieur Lafitte, or the commandant at Barrataria, dated the 31st of August, 1814.

of the flag was disre-
 cepted, after being wound-
 made prisoners; and the

in the restraints of civil-
 in the bonds of society,
 ation and alliance, for
 are. A horde of pirates
 and establishment on the
 of the river Mississippi.
 der of the British forces,
 y, from the neutral terri-
 with his brave followers,
 in, in which he should
 at lands should be given
 pective ranks, on a peace
 property should be guar-
 d asking, in return, that
 Spain, or the allies of G.
 ssels, under the British
 until the commander in
 a guarantee of their fair
 id only to exemplify the
 urrence, that the pirate
 and accordingly, Lafitte's
 elivery of the letter, com-
 merican governor of Lou-

of support, which Great
 ace to employ in opposi-
 n colonial policy. The e-
 versed, the white popula-
 tion of all men. Although
 from the infliction of simi-
 es of America, the danger
 t to a revolt of the slaves
 retaliation, on the part of
 onished her against its
 ation issued by the com-
 esty's squadrons, upon the
 merican planters were in-
 a covert phraseology, that
 design. Thus, admiral
 represented to him, that
 ited States, had expressed
 th a view of entering into

ge warfare, under British auspi-
 cence between Gen. Harrison

nichols, lt. col. commanding his
 Monsieur Lafitte, or the com-
 gust, 1814

His majesty's service, or of being received as free settlers into
 some of his majesty's colonies," proclaimed, that "all those who
 might be disposed to emigrate from the United States, would,
 with their families, be received on board his majesty's ships or
 vessels of war, or at the military posts that might be establish-
 ed upon, or near, the coast of the United States, when they
 would have their choice of either entering into his majesty's
 sea or land forces, or of being sent as free settlers to the
 British possessions in North America, or the West Indies,
 where they would meet all due encouragement"†—But
 even the negroes seem, in contempt, or disgust, to have resist-
 ed the solicitation; no rebellion, or massacre, ensued; and the
 allegation, often repeated, that in relation to those who were
 seduced, or forced, from the service of their masters, instances
 have occurred of some being afterwards transported to the Bri-
 tish West India Islands, and there sold into slavery, for the be-
 nefit of the captors, remains without contradiction. So com-
 plicated an act of injustice, would demand the reprobation of
 mankind. And let the British government, which professes a
 just abhorrence of the African slave trade; which endeavors to
 impose, in that respect, restraints upon the domestic policy of
 France, Spain, and Portugal; answer, if it can, the solemn
 charge against their faith, and their humanity.

3. Great Britain has violated the laws of civilized warfare,
 by plundering private property; by outraging female honor;
 by burning unprotected cities, towns, villages and houses; and
 by laying waste whole districts of an unresisting country.

The menace and the practice of the British naval and milita-
 ry force, "to destroy and lay waste such towns and districts
 upon the American coast, as might be found assailable," have
 been excused upon the pretext of retaliation, for the wanton des-
 truction committed by the American army in Upper Canada;‡ but the fallacy of the pretext has already been exposed. It will
 be recollected, however, that the act of burning Newark was
 instantaneously disavowed by the American government; that
 it occurred in December 1813—and that sir George Prevost
 himself acknowledged, on the 10th of February, 1814, that the
 measure of retaliation for all the previously imputed miscon-
 duct of the American troops, was then full and complete.¶ Be-
 tween the month of February, 1814, when that acknowledge-
 ment was made, and the month of August, 1814, when the Bri-
 tish admiral's denunciation was issued, what are the outrages
 upon the part of the American troops in Canada, to justi-
 fy a call for retaliation? No: it was the system, not the in-
 cident, of the war; and intelligence of the system had been re-
 ceived at Washington, from the American agents in Europe,
 with reference to the operations of admiral Warren, upon the
 shores of the Chesapeake, long before Admiral Cochrane had

† See admiral Cochrane's proclamation, dated Bermuda, the 2nd of A-
 pril, 1814.

‡ See admiral Cochrane's letter to Mr. Monroe, dated August 18, 1814.

¶ See sir George Prevost's letter to gen. Wilkinson, dated the 10th of
 February, 1814.

succeeded to the command of the British fleet on the American station.

As an appropriate introduction to the kind of war, which Great Britain intended to wage against the inhabitants of the United States, transactions occurred in England, under the avowed direction of the government itself, that could not fail to wound the moral sense of every candid and generous spectator. All the officers and mariners of the American merchant ships, who, having lost their vessels in other places, had gone to England on the way to America; or who had been employed in British merchant ships, but were desirous of returning home; or who had been detained, in consequence of condemnation of their vessels under the British orders in council; or who had arrived in England, through any of the other casualties of the seafaring life; were condemned to be treated as prisoners of war: nay, some of them were actually impressed, while soliciting their passports; although not one of their number had been in any way, engaged in hostilities against G. B.; and although the American government had afforded every facility to the departure of the same class, as well as of every class of British subjects from the U. S. for a reasonable period after the declaration of war.* But this act of injustice, for which even the pretext of retaliation has not been advanced, was accompanied by another of still greater cruelty and oppression. The American seamen who had been enlisted, or impressed, into the naval service of Great Britain, were long retained, and many of them are yet retained, on board of British ships of war, where they are compelled to combat against their country and their friends: and even when the British government tardily and reluctantly recognized the citizenship of impressed Americans, to the number exceeding 1000 at a single naval station, and dismissed them from its service on the water; it was only to immure them as prisoners of war on shore.—These unfortunate persons, who had passed into the power of the British government, by a violation of their own rights and inclinations, as well as of the rights of their country, and who could only be regarded as the spoils of unlawful violence, were, nevertheless, treated as the fruits of lawful war. Such was the indemnification which G. Britain offered for the wrongs, that she had inflicted; and such the reward, which she bestowed, for services that she had received.†

Nor has the spirit of British warfare been confined to violations of the usages of civilized nations, in relation to the United States. The system of blockade, by orders in council, has been revived; and the American coast from Maine to Louisiana, has been declared, by the proclamation of a British admiral, to be in a state of blockade, which every day's observation proves to be, practically, ineffectual, and which, indeed,

* See Mr. Beasley's correspondence with the British government, in October, November, and December, 1812.

See, also, the act of Congress, passed the 6th of July, 1812.

† See the letter from Mr. Beasley to Mr. M'Leay, dated the 13th of March 1815.

fleet on the American

the kind of war, which the inhabitants of the England, under the a- f that could not fail to and generous spectator. American merchant ships, aces, had gone to Eng- had been employed in us of returning home; ce of condemnation of a council; or who had other casualties of the treated as prisoners of mpressed, while solicit- their number had been t G. B.; and although every facility to the dery class of British sub- od after the declaration ich even the pretext of e accompanied by another The American seamen to the naval service of many of them are yet r, where they are com- and their friends: and- ly and reluctantly re- Americans, to the num- on, and dismissed them- ly to immure them as fortunate persons, who government, by a vio- tions, as well as of the nly be regarded as the heless, treated as the nification which G. Brit- inflicted; and such the that she had received. t are been confined to ions, in relation to the e, by orders in council, st from Maine to Lou- mation of a British ad- ch every day's observa- al, and which, indeed,

British government, in Oc-

of July, 1812.
day, dated the 13th of March

the whole of the British navy would be enabled to enforce and maintain.† Neither the orders in council, acknowledged to be generally unlawful, and declared to be merely retaliatory upon France; nor the Berlin and Milan decrees, which placed the British Islands in a state of blockade, without the force of a single squadron to maintain it, were, in principle, more injurious to the rights of neutral commerce, than the existing blockade of the United States. The revival, therefore, of the system, without the retaliatory pretext, must demonstrate to the world a determination, on the part of Great Britain, to acquire a commercial monopoly, by every demonstration of her naval power. The trade of the United States with Russia, and with other northern powers, by whose governments no edicts, violating neutral rights, had been issued, was cut off by the operation of the British orders in council of the year 1807, as effectually as their trade with France and her allies, although the retaliatory principle was totally inapplicable to the case. And the blockade of the year 1814, is an attempt to destroy the trade of those nations, and, indeed, of all the other nations of Europe, with the United States; while Great Britain, herself, with the same policy and ardor that marked her illicit trade with France, when France was her enemy, encourages a clandestine traffic between her subjects and the American citizens, wherever her possessions came in contact with the territory of the U. States.

But approaching nearer to the scenes of plunder and violence of cruelty and conflagration, which the British warfare exhibits on the coast of the United States, it must be again asked, what acts of the American government, of its ships of war, or of its armies, had occurred, or were even alleged, as a pretext for the perpetration of this series of outrages? It will not be asserted, that they were sanctioned by the usages of modern war; because the sense of all Europe would revolt at the assertion. It will not be said, that they were the unauthorised excesses of the British troops; because scarcely an act of plunder and violence, of cruelty and conflagration, has been committed, except in the immediate presence, under the positive orders, and with the personal agency of British officers. It must not be again insinuated, that they were provoked by the American example; because it has been demonstrated, that all such insinuations are without colour and without proof. And, after all, the dreadful and disgraceful progress of the British arms, will be traced as the effect of that animosity, arising out of recollections connected with the American revolution, which has already been noticed; or, as the effect of that jealousy, which the commercial enterprise, and native resources, of the United States, are calculated to excite in the councils of a nation, aiming at universal dominion upon the ocean.

In the month of April, 1813, the inhabitants of Poplar Island, in the bay of Chesapeake, were pillaged; and the cattle and other

† See the successive blockades announced by the British government, and the successive naval commanders on the American station.

live stock of the farmers, beyond what the enemy could remove, were wantonly killed.*

In the same month of April, the wharf, the store and the shery at Frenchtown landing, were destroyed, and the private stores, and store houses, in the village of Frenchtown, were burnt.†

In the same month of April, the enemy landed repeatedly on Sharp's Island, and made a general sweep of the stock, affecting, however, to pay for a part of it.‡

On the 3d of May, 1813, the town of Havredegrace was pillaged and burnt by a force under the command of admiral Cockburn. The British officers being admonished, "that with civilized nations at war, private property had always been respected," hastily replied, "that as the Americans wanted war, they should now feel its effects; and that the town should be laid in ashes." They broke the windows of the church; they perloined the houses of their furniture; they stripped women and children of their cloathes; and when an unfortunate female complained that she could not leave her house with her little children, she was unfeelingly told, "that her house should be burnt with herself and children in it."§

On the 6th of May, 1813, Fredericktown and Georgetown, situated on Sassafra river in the state of Maryland, were pillaged and burnt, and the adjacent country was laid waste, by a force under the command of admiral Cockburn; and the officers were the most active on the occasion.¶

On the 22d of June, 1813, the British forces made an attack upon Craney Island, with a view to obtain possession of Norfolk, which the commanding officers had promised, in case of success, to give up to the plunder of the troops.¶ The British were repulsed; but enraged by defeat and disappointment, their course was directed to Hampton, which they entered on the 1st of June. The scene that ensued, exceeds all power of description; and a detail of facts would be offensive to the feelings of decorum, as well as of humanity. "A defenceless and unresisting town was given up to indiscriminate pillage; though civilized war tolerates this only as to fortified places carried by assault, and after summons. Individuals male and female, were stripped naked; a sick man was stabbed twice in the hospital; another sick man was shot in his bed, and in the arms of his wife, who was also wounded, long after the retreat of the American troops; and females, the married and the single, suffered

* See the deposition of Wm. Sears.

† See the depositions of Erisby Anderson and Cordelia Pennington.

‡ See Jacob Gibson's deposition.

§ See the deposition of William T. Kilpatrick, James Wood, Rosanna Moore and R. Mansfield.

¶ See the depositions of John Stavely, William Spencer, Joshua Ward, James Scanlan, Richard Barnaby, P. B. Chandlear, Jonathan Greenwood, John Allen, T. Robertson, M. N. Cannon, and J. T. Veazey.

¶ See General Taylor's letter to the secretary of war, dated the 3d of July, 1812.

the enemy could see.

the store and the private of Frenchtown, were

landed repeatedly on top of the stock, affect-

avredegrace was pil-
mand of admiral Cock-
shed, "that with civi-
d always been respect-
ans wanted war, they
own should be laid in
church; they perloined
ped women and chil-
fortunate female come
e with her little chil-
house should be burnt

own and Georgetown,
of Maryland, were pil-
y was laid waste, by a
burn; and the officers

forces made an attack
ain possession of Nor-
promised, in case of
troops.¶ The British
disappointment, their
they entered on the
s all power of descrip-
sive to the feelings of
defenceless and unre-
ate pillage; though ci-
d places carried by as-
male and female, were
twice in the hospital;
and in the arms of his
the retreat of the A-mo-
and the single, suffered

Cordelia Pennington.

k, James Wood, Rosanna

William Spencer, Joshua
handlear, Jonathan Green-
and J. T. Veazey.

f war, dated the 3d of July.

the extremity of personal abuse from the troops of the enemy, and from the infatuated negroes, at their instigation.* * The fact that these atrocities were committed, the commander of the British fleet admiral Warren, and the commander of the British troops, sir Sidney Beckwith, admitted, without hesitation,†† but they resorted, as on other occasions, to the unworthy and unavailing pretext of a justifiable retaliation. It was said by the British General, "that the excesses at Hampton, were occasioned by an occurrence, at the recent attempt at Craney Island, when the British troops in a barge, sunk by the American guns, clung to the wreck of the boat; but several Americans waded off from the island, fired upon, and shot these men." The truth of the assertion was denied; the act, if it had been perpetrated by the American troops, was promptly disavowed by their commander; and a board of officers appointed to investigate the facts, after stating the evidence, reported an "unbiassed opinion, that the charge against the American troops was unsupported; and that the character of the American soldier for humanity and magnanimity had not been committed, but on the contrary confirmed"†† The result of this enquiry was communicated to the British general; reparation was demanded; but it was soon perceived, that whatever might personally be the liberal dispositions of that officer, no adequate reparation could be made, as the conduct of his troops was directed and sanctioned by his government.‡‡

During the period of these transactions, the village of Lewistown, near the capes of the Delaware, inhabited chiefly by fishermen and pilots, and the village of Stonington, seated upon the shores of Connecticut, were unsuccessfully bombarded.—Armed parties, led by officers of rank, landed daily from the British squadron, making predatory incursions into the open country; rifling and burning the houses and cottages of peaceable and retired families; pillaging the produce of the planter and the farmer; (their tobacco, their grain, and their cattle) committing violence on the persons of the unprotected inhabitants; seizing upon slaves, wherever they could be found, as booty of war; and breaking open the coffins of the dead, in

* * See the letters from Gen. Taylor to admiral Warren, dated the 29th of June, 1813; to gen. sir Sidney Beckwith, dated the 4th and 5th of July, 1813; to the secretary of war, dated the 2d of July, 1813; and to captain Meyers, of the last date.

See, also, the letter from Major Crutchfield to Governor Barbour, dated the 20th of June, 1813; the letters from Capt. Cooper to lieutenant governor Mallory, dated in July, 1813; the report of Messrs Griffin and Lively to major Crutchfield, dated the 4th of July, 1813; and col. Parker's publication in the Enquirer.

†† See admiral Warren's letter to general Taylor, dated the 29th of June, 1813; sir Sidney Beckwith's letter to general Taylor, dated the same day; and the report of Captain Meyers to general Taylor of July 2, 1813.

‡‡ See the report of the proceedings of the board of officers, appointed by the general order, of the 1st of July, 1813.

§§ See general Taylor's letter to Sir Sidney Beckwith, dated the 5th of July, 1813; and the answer of the following day.

search of plunder, or committing robbery on the altars of a church at Chaptico, St. Inagoe, and Tappahannock, with a sanguinary rage.

But the consummation of British outrage, yet remains to be stated, from the awful and imperishable memorials of the capital at Washington. It has been already observed, that the massacre of the American prisoners, at the river Raisin, occurred in January, 1813; that throughout the same year, the desolating warfare of G. Britain, without once alledging a retaliatory excuse, made the shores of the Chesapeake, and of its tributary rivers, a general scene of ruin and distress; and that in the month of February, 1814, sir George Prevost himself, acknowledged, that the measures of retaliation, for the unauthorized burning of Newark, in December, 1813, and for all the excesses which had been imputed to the American army, was at that time full and complete. The United States, indeed, regarding what was due to their own character rather than what was due to the conduct of their enemy, had forborne to authorize a just retribution; and even disdained to place the destruction of Newark to retaliatory account for the general pillage and conflagration which had been previously perpetrated. It was not without astonishment, therefore, that after more than a year of patient suffering, they heard it announced in August, 1814, that the towns and districts upon their coast, were to be destroyed and laid waste, in revenge for unspecified and unknown acts of destruction, which were charged against the American troops in Upper Canada. The letter of admiral Cochrane was dated on the 18th, but it was not received until the 31st of August, 1814. In the intermediate time, the enemy debarked a body of about five or six thousand troops at Benedict, on the Patuxent, and by a sudden and steady march through Bladensburg, approached the city of Washington. This city has been selected for the seat of the American government; but the number of its houses does not exceed 900, spread over an extensive site; the whole number of its inhabitants does not exceed 6000; and the adjacent country is thinly populated. Although the necessary precautions had been ordered to assemble the militia, for the defence of the city, a variety of causes combined to render the defence unsuccessful; and the enemy took possession of Washington on the evening of the 24th of August, 1814. The commanders of the British force held at that time admiral Cochrane's desolating order, although it was then unknown to the government and the people of the United States; but conscious of the danger of so distant a separation from the British fleet, and desirous, by every plausible artifice, to deter the citizens from flying to arms against the invaders, they disavowed all design of injuring private persons and property, and gave assurances of protection, wherever there was submission. General Ross and admiral Cockburn then proceeded in person to direct and superintend the business of conflagration; in a place which had yielded to their arms, which was unfortified, and by which no hostility was threatened. They set fire to the capitol, within whose

wa
St
of
br
ere
set
con
tra
me
and
nig
tish
in
ed
tha
bec
ed
and
W
of
evi
the
the
tion
was
flig
tish
or
pre
ed,
ma
fer
ord
and
rem
anc
and
stru
way
new
the
of t
da,
lang
shin
Am
The

ry on the altars of a
pahannock, with a sa-

ge, yet remains to be
memorials of the capi-
served, that the mas-
river Raisin, occurred
me year, the desolat-
ledging a retaliatory
ke, and of its tributa-
tress; and that in the
most himself, acknow-
for the unauthorized
and for all the exces-

can army, was at that
ates, indeed, regarding
er than what was due
rne to authorize a just
ne destruction of New-
illage and conflagration

It was not without es-
than a year of patient
ugust, 1814, that the
re to be destroyed and
d unknown acts of de-

the American troops in
Cochrane was dated on
e 31st of August, 1814.
arked a body of about
n the Patuxent, and by
densburg, approached
been selected for the
the number of its houses

extensive site; the
not exceed 6000; and
Although the neces-
semble the militia, for
ces combined to render
my took possession of

of August, 1814. The
that time admiral Cochrane
then unknown to the go-
States; but conscious of
om the British fleet, and
deter the citizens from
they disavowed all design

, and gave assurances of
ion General Ross and
esen to direct and super-
a place which had yield-
d, and by which no hos-

the capitol, within whose

walls were contained the halls of the congress of the United States, the hall of their highest tribunal for the administration of justice, the archives of the legislature and the national library. They set fire to the edifice, which the United States had erected for the residence of their chief magistrate. And they set fire to the costly and extensive buildings, erected for the accommodation of the principal officers of the government, in the transaction of the public business. These magnificent monuments of the progress of the arts, which America had borrowed from her parent Europe, with all the testimonials of taste and literature which they contained, were on the memorable night of the 24th of August, consigned to the flames, while British officers of high rank and command, united with their troops in riotous carousal, by the light of the burning pile.

But the character of the incendiary had so entirely superceded the character of the soldier, on this unparalleled expedition, that a great portion of the munitions of war, which had not been consumed, when the navy yard was ordered to be destroyed upon the approach of the British troops, were left untouched; and an extensive foundry of cannon, adjoining the city of Washington, was left uninjured; when in the night of the 25th of August, the army suddenly decamped, and returning, with evident marks of precipitation and alarm, to their ships, left the interment of their dead, and the care of their wounded to the enemy, whom they had thus injured and insulted, in violation of the laws of civilized war.

The counterpart of the scene exhibited by the British army, was next exhibited by the British navy. Soon after the midnight flight of general Ross from Washington, a squadron of British ships of war ascended the Potomac and reached the town of Alexandria on the 27th of August, 1814. The magistrates, presuming that the general destruction of the town was intended, asked on what terms it might be saved. The naval commander declared, "that the only conditions in his power to offer" were such as not only required a surrender of all naval and ordnance stores, (public and private) but of all the shipping; and of all the merchandise in the city, as well as such as had been removed, since the 19th of August." The conditions, therefore, amounted to the entire plunder of Alexandria, an unfortified and unresisting town, in order to save the buildings from destruction. The capitulation was made, and the enemy bore away the fruits of his predatory enterprize in triumph.

But even while this narrative is passing from the press a new retaliatory pretext has been formed to cover the disgrace of the scene which was transacted at Washington. In the address of the governor in chief to the provincial parliament of Canada, on the 24th of January, 1815, it is asserted, in ambiguous language, "that, as a just retribution, the proud capitol at Washington has experienced a similar fate to that inflicted by an American force on the seat of government in Upper Canada."—The town of York, in Upper Canada, was taken by the Am.

rican army under the command of general Dearborn, on the 27th of April, 1813;* and it was evacuated on the succeeding 1st of May; although it was again visited for a day by an American squadron under the command of commodore Chauncey, on the 4th of August.† At the time of the capture, the enemy on his retreat set fire to his magazine, and the injury produced by the explosion was great and extensive; but neither then nor on the visit of commodore Chauncey, was any edifice which had been erected for civil uses, destroyed by the authority of the military or the naval commander; and the destruction of such edifices, by any part of their force, would have been a direct violation of the positive orders which they had issued. On both occasions, indeed, the public stores of the enemy were authorised to be seized, and his public store houses to be burnt; but it is known that private persons, houses, and property, were left uninjured. If, therefore, sir George Prevost deems such acts inflicted on "the seat of government in Upper Canada" similar to the acts which were perpetrated at Washington, he has yet to perform the task of tracing the features of similarity; since, at Washington the public edifices which had been erected for civil uses were alone destroyed, while the munitions of war, and the foundries of cannon, remained untouched.

If, however, it be meant to affirm, that the public edifices, occupied by the legislature, by the chief magistrate, by the courts of justice, and by the civil functionaries of the province of Upper Canada, with the provincial Library, were destroyed by the American force; it is an occurrence which has never been before presented to the view of the American government by its own officers, as a matter of information; nor by any of the military or civil authorities of Canada, as matter of complaint; it is an occurrence which no American commander had in any degree authorised or approved; and it is an occurrence which the American government would have censured and repaired with equal promptitude and liberality.

But a tale told thus out of date, for a special purpose, cannot command the confidence of the intelligent and the candid auditor: for, even if the fact of conflagration be true, suspicion must attend the cause for so long a concealment, with motives so strong for an immediate disclosure. When Sir George Prevost, in February, 1814, acknowledged that the measure of retaliation was full and complete, for all the preceeding misconduct imputed to the American troops, was he not apprised of every fact, which had occurred at York, the capital of Upper Canada, in the months of April and August, 1813? Yet, neither then, nor at any antecedent period, nor until the 24th Jan. 1815, was the slightest intimation given of the retaliatory pretext, which is now offered. When the admirals Warren and Cockrane were employed in pillaging and burning the villages on the

* See the letter from Gen. Dearborn to the secretary of war, dated the 26th and 27th of April, 1813.

† See the letter from commodore Chauncey to the secretary of the navy, dated the 4th of August, 1813.

shores of the Chesapeake, were not all the retaliatory pretenses for the barbarous warfare known to those commanders? And yet, "the fate inflicted by an American force on the seat of government in Upper Canada," was never suggested in justification or excuse? and finally, when the expedition was formed in August, 1814, for the destruction of the public edifices at Washington, was not the "similar fate which had been inflicted by an American force on the seat of Government in Upper Canada," known to admiral Cochrane, as well as to Sir George Prevost, who called upon the admiral (it is alleged) to carry into effect measures of retaliation, against the inhabitants of the United States? And yet, both the call, and the compliance, are founded (not upon the destruction of the public edifices at York, but) upon the destruction committed by the American army in Upper Canada, upon the inhabitants of the province, for whom a reparation was demanded.

Obscurity, then, dwells upon the fact alleged by Sir George, which has not been dissipated by enquiry. Whether any public edifice was improperly destroyed at York, or at what period the injury was done, if done at all, and by what hand it was inflicted, are points that ought to have been stated when the charge was made; surely it is enough on the part of the American government to repeat, that the fact alleged was never before brought to its knowledge, for investigation, disavowal or reparation. The silence of the military and civil officers of the provincial government of Canada, indicates, too a sense of shame, or a conviction of the injustice of the present reproach. It is known, that there could have been no other public edifice for civil uses destroyed in Upper Canada, than the house of the provincial legislature, a building of so little cost and ornament, as hardly to merit consideration; and certainly affording neither parallel nor apology, for the conflagration of the splendid structures, which adorned the metropolis of the United States. If, however, that house was indeed destroyed, may it not have been an accidental consequence of the conflagration, in which the explosion of the magazine involved the house? Or, perhaps it was hastily perpetrated by some of the enraged troops in the moment of anguish, for the loss of a beloved commander, and their companions, who had been killed by that explosion, kindled as it was by a defeated enemy, for the sanguinary and unavailing purpose: Or, in fine, some suffering individual, remembering the slaughter of his brethren at the river Raisin, and exasperated by the spectacle of a human scalp, suspended in the legislative chamber, over the seat of the speaker, may, in the paroxysm of his vengeance, have applied, unauthorised and unseen, the torch of vengeance and destruction.

Many other flagrant instances of British violence, pillage and conflagration, in defiance of the laws of civilized hostilities, might be added to the catalogue, which has been exhibited; but the enumeration would be superfluous, and it is time to close so

eral Dearborn, on the evacuated on the succumbed for a day by command of commodore the time of the capture, magazine, and the injury and extensive; but neither Chauncey, was any uses, destroyed by the commander; and the destruction of their force, would have leaders which they had is public stores of the enemy public store houses to persons, houses, and property, sir George Prevost of government in Upper Canada, perpetrated at Washington, tracing the features of public edifices which had destroyed, while the munitions, remained untouched. That the public edifices, chief magistrate, by the coronaries of the province Library, were destroyed the which has never been American government by tion; nor by any of the as matter of complaint; commander had in any destruction occurrence which the insured and repaired with

special purpose, cannot be true, suspicion concealment, with motives When Sir George Prevost, that the measure of retaliation, the preceding misconduct, was he not apprised of York, the capital of Upper Canada, August, 1813? Yet, neither until the 24th Jan. 1815 the retaliatory pretext, admirals Warren and Cochrane, burning the villages on the secretary of war, dated the to the secretary of the navy,

painful an exposition of the causes and character of the war. The exposition had become necessary to repel and refute the charges of the Prince Regent, when by his declaration of January, 1813, he unjustly states the United States to be the aggressors in the war; and insultingly ascribes the conduct of the American government to the influence of French councils. It was also necessary to vindicate the course of the United States in the prosecution of the war; and to expose to the view of the world, the barbarous system of hostilities, which the British government has pursued. Having accomplished these purposes, the American government recurs with pleasure to a contemplation of its early and continued efforts, for the restoration of peace. Notwithstanding the pressure of recent wrongs, and the unfriendly and illiberal disposition, which Great Britain, has, at all times, manifested towards them, the United States have never indulged sentiments incompatible with the reciprocity of good will, and an intercourse of mutual benefit and advantage. They can never repine, at seeing the British nation great, prosperous and happy; safe in its maritime rights; and powerful in its means of maintaining them; but at the same time, they can never cease to desire, that the councils of Great Britain should be guided by justice, and a respect for the equal rights of other nations. Her maritime power may extend to all the legitimate objects of her sovereignty, and her commerce, without endangering the independence and peace of every other government. A ballance of power in this respect, is as necessary on the ocean as on the land; and the controul that it gives to the nations of the world, over the actions of each other, is as salutary in its operation to the individual government, which feels it as to all the governments, by which, on the just principles of mutual support and defence it may be exercised. On fair and equal and honorable terms, therefore, peace is at the choice of Great Britain; but if she still determine upon war, the United States reposing upon the justness of their cause; and upon the patriotism of their citizens; upon the distinguished valour of their land and naval forces; and above all, upon the dispensations of divine providence; are ready to maintain the contest, for the preservation of the national independence, with the same energy and fortitude, which were displayed in acquiring it.

Washington, February 10, 1815.

8
d character of the war, as
to repel and refute the
by his declaration of Jan-
States to be the aggress-
bes the conduct of the A-
of French councils. It
urse of the United States
expose to the view of the
ies, which the British go-
mplished these purposes,
pleasure to a contempla-
s, for the restoration of
of recent wrongs, and the
which Great Britain has,
the United States have
le with the reciprocity of
ual benefit and advantage.
British nation great, pros-
e rights; and powerful in
t the same time, they can
of Great Britain should
the equal rights of other
extend to all the legiti-
her commerce, without
ce of every other govern-
spect, is as necessary on
troul that it gives to the
f each other, is as saluta-
overnment, which feels it
the just principles of mu-
rcised. On fair and equal
is at the choice of Great
n war, the United States
use; and upon the patri-
inguished valour of their
upon the dispensations of
tain the contest, for the
nce, with the same ener-
d in acquiring it.

